UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THOMAS KILLIGREW

Cavalier Dramatist

1612-83

By

ALFRED HARBAGE

A THESIS
IN ENGLISH

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PHILADELPHIA
1930

THOMAS KILLIGREW

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41547322_0019

Thomas Killegrew
Charles the first Groome
Charles the Second and his
Republique of Venice

Page of Honour to King
of the Bedchamber to King
Mtie's Ma: Resident with the
in the yeare 1650.

THOMAS KILLIGREW

Cavalier Dramatist

1612-83

A THESIS

IN ENGLISH

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

ALFRED HARBAGE

PHILADELPHIA

1930

Copyright, 1930
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS
Printed in the United States of America by
Lancaster Press, Inc., Lancaster, Pa.

TO ELIZA

PREFACE

Thomas Killigrew's career as manager of the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane has figured largely in two recent histories of the Restoration stage, but as yet there has been no extended treatment of his life and literary works. In 1691 Gerard Langbaine devoted a few pages of his compendium to Killigrew's plays, and this has remained, except for scattered comment in comprehensive works on the drama, the last word on the subject. Whereas his plays have evoked little comment of any kind, the dramatist's life has evoked much which is not true. The only biographical account at all accurate and unprejudiced is the note by Joseph Knight in the *Dictionary of National Biography,* and this is necessarily short and fragmentary. The aim of the present book is to present a life of Killigrew based upon contemporary sources of information, and a study of his works viewed in relation to the literature of their time.

My chief debt to older workers is to G. C. Boase and W. P. Courtney whose bibliography of Cornwall and Cornishmen has been of great aid in preparing the preliminary sketch of the Killigrew family. Indebtedness to other scholars has been acknowledged in the text. I wish to thank my colleagues, Professors Baugh and Haviland, and Mr. Chester, for the references they have volunteered, and Messrs. Allen and O'Neill for their patient assistance with the proof. I wish also to thank

Professor F. E. Schelling, not only for his friendly guidance and criticism during the preparation of this book, but also for all he has given me during the many hours I have spent in his class room.

A. H.

Drexel Hill,
November, 1929

CONTENTS

Portrait of Thomas Killigrew, from *Comedies and Tragedies,* London, 1664 ..... *Frontispiece*

PAGE

Preface vii

Introduction 1

I

A Family of Courtiers 10

II

A Younger Son 41

III

A Playwright in Exile 76

IV

A Royal Favorite 111

V

Amateur Plays 141

VI

Semi-professional Plays 176

VII

"Closet Drama" 203

Bibliography 232

Index 240

INTRODUCTION

No minor literary figure of the seventeenth century is better known, by name, than Thomas Killigrew. At the reopening of the theatres after the Interregnum, he was appointed with Sir William Davenant co-monopolist of the London stage, and for over a decade he governed the King's Players and managed the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane. His position as royal patentee and ultimately as Master of the Revels during a period of dramatic fecundity has won him prominence in English literary history—a vicarious prominence, because quite unrelated to his own pretensions as a playwright. Other factors have combined to make Killigrew conspicuous. He was an active Royalist in the romantic era of civil war and of exile; he was specified a Wit in an age when every gentleman aspired to be witty; he was a companion and favorite of the King at a time when the English court was a center of alleged social brilliance. These indications of a colorful personality, particularly this intimacy with the debauched Charles II, have sufficed to nourish the waxing legend that this man was a roistering cavalier and a Restoration roué. Among those versed in the lore of old jest-books, of memoirs, and of lives of the rakes, the mention of Thomas Killigrew is sufficient to evoke a reminiscent chuckle. Tradition has bestowed notoriety upon him, and no one has troubled to examine its justice.

Killigrew's plays have fared no better than the name

of their author, and they are known only by disrepute. Just one play has gained a number of readers and has been reprinted since his death, a ribald comedy called *The Parson's Wedding*. Since most of Killigrew's plays are lacking in the congenial qualities which have made this comedy popular with a certain class of readers, these readers have found them disappointing. Other readers, with a decent distaste for vulgarity however witty, have allowed *The Parson's Wedding* to prejudice their attitude toward Killigrew's other works. One modern author, having confessed to an acquaintance with this comedy, has breathed the pious wish that he never be constrained to read a second Killigrew play—obviously not the manner of arriving at a fair estimate. No one has attempted to seek the best in Killigrew's plays, nor to determine how they may be significant to students of English drama.

There is a rigid conviction, based upon tradition, half-knowledge and hearsay, that Killigrew lived a vicious life and wrote worthless plays. One who concerns himself with this man's life and works risks suspicion of guilt—guilt of biographical scandal-raking and of literary pot-scraping. Yet the risk is worth taking. If the function of research is to serve truth by combating the tendency of passive knowledge to become formalized, schematized, degraded into patterns, then research can perform yeoman service in connection with the life and works of Thomas Killigrew. Killigrew was not a wild and dissipated rake: he lived a life neither better nor worse than the lives of contemporaries in his circle. He was a much better

man than his King. His plays are lacking in great literary merit, but they are interesting. To the student of literature they are as revealing as any plays of their time.

Although Killigrew was not a dissipated rake, his biography is interesting nevertheless. His career, or better perhaps, the career of the family of which he was the most prominent member, is a complete chapter in English social history. An old Cornish family, locally important for generations, the Killigrews began to find employment with English kings in the reign of Henry VIII. Thomas Killigrew's grandfather was one of those younger sons whom it became customary in the family to send up to London. William Killigrew became a rebel and exile under Queen Mary, and, in consequence, a courtier and pensioner under Queen Elizabeth. He was appointed vice-chamberlain to the Queen, rose to knighthood and to precarious affluence, and founded a family whose members, although social parvenus, enjoyed prerogative to be employed in minor positions about the court. His son Robert was an entrepreneur and courtier in the reigns of James and the first Charles. He too was knighted and became vice-chamberlain to a queen—Henrietta Maria, wife of Charles I. Sir Robert maintained a town house and a spacious country estate held in fee farm from the crown, and he reared a large family of children, among whom Thomas was not the only one destined to cut a figure in the world. Thomas's brothers and sisters all revolved as lesser planets about the Stuart court, at home and in exile. What they lacked in wealth and

family prestige they made up for in energy and talent. The variety of their employments is indicated by the fact that one of Thomas's brothers was a king's chaplain, while one of his sisters was a king's mistress. Two brothers as well as himself had plays produced upon the London stage. This generation as a whole did not fulfill its promise: the times were adverse for minor courtiers, and instability and extravagance contributed to the failure in life of a number of the Killigrews.

Thomas was the fourth son of Sir Robert. He received practically nothing in the way of academic or professional training, or in the way of patrimony. Beginning a career at court as page to Charles I, he made his mark by his personal charm, his wit, and his initiative. As a young man he enjoyed the friendship of Thomas Carew and of the brilliant Walter Montague, with whom he toured Italy in 1635–36. He married a maid of honor of Henrietta Maria, and moved in the circle of the French Queen. The nature of his early plays, amateur productions written before and during the journey to Italy, is explained by this fact. They are such plays as the Queen loved, ultra-romantic tragi-comedies, interesting to the student of drama as transitional types from older tragi-comedy to the heroic plays of the Restoration, and as early examples of plays drawing their material from the French heroic romance, a type of fiction which was to ripen in the work of La Calprenède and Scudéry and furnish pabulum to Restoration playwrights.

At the age of twenty-six, Killigrew was a widower and the father of a son—a son whose vicious career was

to be amalgamated by subsequent generations with the career of his father, and was to furnish one of the chief reasons why the playwright has been held in such ill repute down until our own day. In the years preceding the outbreak of the Civil Wars, the uneasy position of the royal family affected the circumstances of the young courtier. He continued to live in elegance, and became in consequence an habitual debtor. Toward the end of this period he published several of his plays, and wrote the comedy which has already been alluded to. *The Parson's Wedding* was not designed for a special coterie, but for a popular audience, the dramatist apparently having his eye upon the lucrative possibilities of the public theatres. The comedy is in the manner of its time in that its plot is a mosaic of themes and situations tested by older dramatists, but its general tone foreshadows the comedy of the Restoration from which the play is in many respects indistinguishable. The wit and adroitness of the dialogue is offset by the vulgarity of the piece, a vulgarity which can be explained only by the possibility that the author was rebelling with undue violence against the courtly cult of platonic love. The cult was firmly intrenched in the Queen's circle, and its loquacious affectations were such as to produce a dangerous surfeit in a young man. Only one later play of Killigrew's could possibly have been written with a stage in view. This is *The Pilgrim,* a competent and interesting tragedy in the *Hamlet* tradition, which may have been written for the strolling actors employed by Prince Charles in Paris in 1646.

At the beginning of armed hostilities between Charles I

and Parliament, Killigrew was active in His Majesty's cause, but his operations were soon ended by his arrest and detention in London until 1643. Upon his release, he went into exile on the continent, where he remained until the year of the Restoration. His career in exile is the most interesting part of his life, but it is too full of incident to be described in resumé. Active and resourceful, Killigrew placed himself in the thick of Royalist affairs, and served individually all of the exiled Stuarts. He was sent on a money-borrowing expedition by Prince Charles in 1647, and from 1649 until 1652 he was the new King's ambassador to Venice and the states of northern Italy. Dismissed by the Venetians on the charge of venal conduct, he returned northward in disgrace. Not until the present time has it been shown that Killigrew was the victim of a ruthless diplomacy, that the Venetians concocted their charges against the ambassador in order to provide themselves with an excuse to King Charles for dismissing a Royalist whose presence was embarrassing them in the eyes of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth. This whole curious episode can be traced in some detail.

Toward the end of the Exile, Killigrew entered the service of the House of Orange. He had previously taken as his second wife a Dutch heiress with whom he settled at Maestricht and by whom he had several sons. During his career as ambassador and as itinerant courtier he had continued to write plays. Except for *The Pilgrim,* these plays—"closet dramas"—are of prodigious length and were written simply for their author's

amusement. They are interesting for their use of sources, for their language and their mannerisms, and in one instance for the revealing descriptions of the English exiles. The last of them, *Thomaso or The Wanderer,* is perhaps unique in being semi-autobiographical in nature.

After 1660 Killigrew was established in London as groom of the bedchamber and lesser favorite of King Charles II. His wit and vivacity, perhaps a certain eccentricity and refreshing capacity to utter hard truths, must have recommended him to the unconventional young monarch more than his past services to the family. He wrote no plays after 1654, but he was established as a power ex officio in the dramatic world of the Restoration. Although in late middle age upon his return to England, he remained active for a number of years, not only as a courtier and theatre manager but as a man of affairs generally; and the records of his business ventures, his financial expedients, his domestic life, and his relations with his contemporaries, are sufficiently full to round out a rather complete biography. Over seventy when he died, his life had been full of action and variety, picturesque perhaps, but neither lurid nor disgraceful. Killigrew was boastful and talkative, and in other ways his gestures seem to have been broad, but there is no evidence that his actual conduct ever trespassed the code—the rather easy code—of Gentlemen of the King's Party.

A study of Killigrew's life is profitable in more ways than in correcting an impression. He was one of those cavalier dabblers in the arts whose literary remains,

fragmentary and uneven, mark an episode in the history of English letters. The periodic flashes of genius which illuminate the work of this group are saddening in their revelation of waste. One cannot dismiss the impression that the cavalier authors were artists and thinkers spoiled—spoiled by being born too late, by living in the wrong age, by owing allegiance to false causes and bad masters. Owing to his numerous official appointments, it is possible to reconstruct the career of Killigrew more completely than those of Denham, Lovelace, Suckling, or practically any of the cavalier group; and by observing that career we can learn much about this group and the manner in which the influence of court and king operated upon the loyal subject. As we traverse the seventeenth century with this courtier and dramatist, we glimpse the lives or works of a surprising number of authors, from the time of Jonson and Carew to the time of Dryden and Aphra Behn. On one occasion even the figure of John Milton looms in our path—playing an appropriate part as an angel of retribution. It is pleasant to establish these contacts. It is also pleasant to establish contacts with historical events, occasionally in a new and surprisingly intimate way.

A study of Killigrew's plays leads to something which a casual reading of them and a mere appraisal of their intrinsic merit might fail to indicate. While Killigrew was primarily a courtier and only secondarily a dramatist, and while his plays never belie the fact that he turned to authorship only sporadically and as a dilettante, he produced a considerable body of work,

and this work is absolutely characteristic of its time. It is in a logical line of development, and knowledge of it tends to complete our picture of the great period of English drama. Killigrew began to write in 1635—late autumn in Stuart drama—and his blank verse, culmination of a steady process of disintegration, is simply rhythmic prose, while his characters and sentiments, drawn from sources other than actual life, frequently ring false to the truth. Nevertheless his plays do belong to the pre-Restoration period of drama, and occasional speeches, sometimes entire scenes, reveal that even as late a comer as Thomas Killigrew could glean a little after the great harvest of English poetic drama had been gathered in.

I

A FAMILY OF COURTIERS

THOMAS KILLIGREW belonged to an ancient Cornish family. Had he been inclined (and there is no doubt that he frequently was, since vainglory is one weakness which tradition has attached to him without injustice), he might have boasted that among his ancestors was numbered no less a luminary than Richard Coeur de Lion. According to family tradition, to Hals the seventeenth-century Cornish antiquarian, and to the more modern expert in heraldry, the family originated from King Richard's nephew and namesake the Earl of Cornwall, titular King of the Romans, and his concubine Jean de Valletorta, widow of Sir Alexander Oakeston.[1] The family arms, as described by Hals "within a field Argent, an imperial eagle with two necks, within a bordure Bezanté Sable,"[2] certainly derive from those of Prince Richard.

[1] In 1738 Martin Killigrew wrote a history of the Killigrew family confining himself unfortunately to the less notable older branch, of which he was, by adoption, the last male representative. His history is abstracted by R. N. Worth in "The Family of Killigrew," *Journal of the Royal Institute of Cornwall,* April, 1871, pp. 269–82. The materials collected by William Hals (first published in *The Complete History of Cornwall,* Exeter, 1750) are incorporated in *The Parochial History of the County of Cornwall,* 4 vols., anon. editor, Truro and London, 1867; see I, 389. See further M. A. Lower, *Curiosities of Heraldry,* London, 1845, p. 309; and *N. & Q.,* First Series, I, 231.

[2] The arms of the present city of Falmouth derive from those of the Killigrew family. Thomas Killigrew was very proud of his double-headed eagle and used the device for his official stamp when master of the revels (see a reproduction of it employed as a tailpiece in George Chalmers'

Whether the early connection of the Killigrews with the Plantagenets was one of consanguinity or mere feudal dependence it is impossible to say, but it is certain that as early as the first years of the thirteenth century the family enjoyed considerable prestige in Cornwall. The word "Killigrew" itself (spelled in a multitude of ways) is a place-name said to signify "a grove of eagles,"[3] and the original seat of the "Lords of Killigrew" lay in the parish of St. Erme about five miles north of the present city of Truro. The family line has been traced unbroken by the genealogist[4] since the time of one Raphe Killigrew living in the reign of Henry III. The family steadily increased in affluence for a number of generations, assisted by the habit of contracting rich marriages, a knack which it never quite lost. By the time of Chaucer they were sending sons to Oxford, and until the end this was the family university. The first mention of Killigrews at Oxford occurs in 1349 when two of them, a Michael and a Richard, were in trouble for student rioting.[5] It is not uncharacteristic that this early mention should present

Apology for Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers, London, 1797–1800), and had it embossed upon the folio of his plays which he presented to the Bodleian. In the engraving of the author by Faithorne, prefixed to this 1664 folio, the family arms even ornament the collar of his dog.

[3] This meaning is suspect. It is suggested by W. H. Tregellas, *Cornish Worthies,* 2 vols., London, 1884, II, 115. This book is characteristic of a fairly large class of works which have made capital of the picturesque Killigrews. It is entertaining, but inaccurate in nearly every detail.

[4] J. L. Vivian, *Visitations of Cornwall,* Exeter, 1887, p. 270. The genealogy of the younger branch is not completely supplied, and has been supplemented in the present study by reference to the family wills lodged in the Principal Probate Registry in Somerset House, London.

[5] Anthony à Wood, *History and Antiquities of Oxford,* J. Gutch, Ed., 3 vols., London, 1792–96, I, 447–49.

the Killigrews in this light. Members of the family were marked by very definite and persistent traits, and a certain irregularity and disregard for established authority was one of them. Records of the family touching any generation indicate that the men were handsome and courageous, great soldiers and duelists, very enterprising, the first to conceive of or co-operate in a new scheme; but unstable, hot-tempered, and above all extravagant. Judging from contemporary comment and the marriages they made, the women must have been vivacious and beautiful.

In the time of Richard II, Simon Killigrew, Lord of that time, married Jane, daughter and heir of Robert, Lord of the Manor of Arwenack. The Killigrews removed to the more extensive manor, and their lands now embraced the harbor known today as Falmouth. This geographical fact is the ultimate reason why four Killigrews have a place in English literary history. Falmouth Harbor was formerly more important than it is today, not only because it could accommodate a vast fleet of ships, but because of its strategic position in time of war. In his preparations for national defense Henry VIII saw fit to rent a piece of land from the Killigrews and to erect Pendennis Castle overlooking the harbor. John Killigrew of Arwenack, Sheriff of Cornwall, great-grandfather of our dramatist, was appointed its first governor, and a lasting intercourse was established between this family and the English court. The strong Protestant bias notable in later generations of the family probably dates from the final years of the reign of King Henry. John Killigrew, the first gov-

ernor of the fort, is said to have had a house "the finest and most costly then in the County," an estate of £6000 a year, and lands extending from Arwenack to Helford passage.[6] Three of his sons founded important branches of the family. His daughter Margaret married into the Godolphin family,[7] and his granddaughter Elizabeth (daughter of Sir Henry Killigrew) married into the Lower family.[8] Cornishmen have not been remarkable for their artistic accomplishments, and it is interesting that the Godolphins, the Lowers, and the Killigrews were the only ones to contribute anything notable to English literature until the time of Samuel Foote.

William, the fifth son of John Killigrew of Arwenack, founded the London branch of the family which was to produce a line of courtiers and literary amateurs. The older branch continued at Arwenack and retained as a family perquisite the governorship of Pendennis Castle. The fort under local mismanagement and governmental neglect fell into decay. This was especially true after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, when the fort, and indeed the whole neighborhood of the harbor, became notorious for smuggling and even piracy.[9] The

[6] "The Family of Killigrew:" See above, note 1.

[7] H. H. Drake, *Hasted's History of Kent, Part I, The Hundred of Blackheath,* London, 1886, p. xxii.

[8] G. C. Boase & W. P. Courtney, *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis,* 3 vols., London, 1874–82, I, 287.

[9] The daughter-in-law of John Killigrew of Arwenack herself was known as "the lady pirate" and narrowly escaped punishment for the sack of the *Mary of St. Sebastian,* a ship which had taken refuge in the harbor. The crew of the ship were murdered, and a curse was popularly supposed to have descended on the family because of this crime. See H. M. Whitley, "Dame Killigrew and the Spanish Ship," *Journal R. I. C.,* 1883, pp. 282–87. In

irregularities of the Killigrews, whose prosperity had sharply declined, became so flagrant that the charge of the fort was taken from them and was finally transferred to the younger branch.[10] Had it not been that the third John Killigrew of Arwenack married a member of the Monck family, and his descendants were patronized by the powerful General Monck in Interregnum times,[11] the older branch of the family would have come to dissolution years earlier than it did. As the older branch declined, the younger branch rose in prosperity. It is interesting that the founders of this branch began their climb as friends to the cause of Princess Elizabeth and rebels against Queen Mary. William Killigrew and his more remarkable brother, Henry, inherited as Cornishmen and as Killigrews maritime experience and allegiance to the Protestant cause. In 1554 "the Killigrews" are mentioned among the rebels joining Sir Peter Carew in France and vowing that the "Prince of Spain should set no foot in English shores." In May, 1556, Henry Killigrew is mentioned specifically as an organizer of Queen Mary's enemies abroad, associated with the Tremaynes, young Stafford, Courtenay, and the rest in their successful raids on Spanish shipping.[12] When Elizabeth finally ascended

1588 her son John Killigrew, then head of the family, was marching about the county with an armed retinue resisting arrest. At this time he was governor of the castle and vice-admiral of the County of Cornwall! See "Maritime History of Cornwall," *Victoria History of the Counties of England, Cornwall,* 1906, I, 487.

[10] S. P. Oliver, *Pendennis & St. Mawes, An Historical Sketch of Two Cornish Castles,* London, 1875, p. 22.

[11] *Ibid.,* p. 68.

[12] J. A. Froude, *History of England,* 12 vols., London, 1867, VI, 199, 452.

the throne, the Killigrew brothers became her trusted servants.

Although William Killigrew headed the branch of the family in which we are concerned, Henry Killigrew is of interest to us because it was largely to his superior abilities that his brother owed his success. Henry Killigrew was the type of inconspicuous Elizabethan statesman which helps to explain the prosperous reign of the Virgin Queen. He was most frequently employed as an agent in the delicate diplomatic arrangements with the Scots, but his embassies and missions took him to nearly every nation in Europe.[13] His taskmaster, of course, was Lord Burghley, to whom he was related by his marriage to Katherine Cooke. Of the four "learned and beautiful" daughters of Sir Anthony Cooke, one had married Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal; another, William Cecil, Lord High Treasurer; and a third, Henry Killigrew.[14] On one occasion Katherine interceded for her husband, who was being overworked, by sending to her sister Mildred, wife of Cecil, a protest clothed in the elegant dress of a Latin epigram. Burghley was not the only influential acquaintance of Henry Killigrew. Leicester has praised his mettle and referred to him as his "little Hal Killigrew."[15] He enjoyed a long and close friendship with

[13] A testimony of the busy diplomatic career of Henry Killigrew is the profuse records of his missions, which exist in the Public Record Office, among the *Additional MSS* in the British Museum, among the *Cottonian MSS*, the *Landsdowne MSS*, and in nearly all the collections calendared by the Historical Manuscripts Commission.

[14] T. F. Henderson, *D. N. B.*, XXXI, 107.

[15] H. H. Drake: *op. cit.*, p. xxii.

Sir Francis Walsingham.[16] To Queen Elizabeth he was always her "trustie servant," and he was finally knighted by Essex. His character is as interesting as his diplomatic career. Apparently he was a Puritan in his sympathies and favored that sect as much as he dared.[17] Yet he had none of the narrowness which came to characterize the Puritan of later times. We know that he was a soldier; and Lloyd, his eulogist, has told us that he was notable not only as a diplomatist, but as a scholar, an antiquarian, a connoisseur in music, and as a writer of "an even and apt style." He was also a painter:

> No man could draw any place or work better, none fancy and paint a Portraicture more lively, being a Durer for proportion, a Goltzius for a bold touch, variety of posture, a curious and true shadow, an Angelo for his happy fancy, and an Holben for Oyl works.[18]

In a word he was a true Elizabethan. In 1603, the year of his death, a fellow Cornishman published a book in which there is a description of his old age:

> Sir Henry Killigrew, after Ambassades and messages, and many other employments of peace and warre, in his Prince's service, to the good of his Countrey, hath made choyce of a retired estate, and reverently regarded by all sorts, placeth his principal contentment in himselfe, which, to a life so well acted, can no way bee wanting.[19]

[16] Conyers Read, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth,* 3 vols., London, 1925, III, 430n.

[17] *Ibid.,* II, 262. In the light of Thomas Killigrew's harsh satire of the Puritans in his *Parson's Wedding* it is interesting that both his granduncle and grandfather had Puritan leanings.

[18] (Lloyd's) *State Worthies,* second edition, London, 1670, p. 586.

[19] Richard Carew, *The Survey of Cornwall, and an epistle concerning the Excellence of the English Tongue,* London, 1769 edition, p. 61.

This assorts well with Lloyd's statement that he was a "spotless man," chiefly because "furnished always with something to do." His daughters married fashionably,[20] and his sons died gallant deaths as Royalists in the Civil Wars.[21]

Between Henry Killigrew and his brother William there existed a very pleasant relationship. On several occasions they were enfeoffed in estates together, or individually at each other's soliciting. In 1573 Henry used his influence with Burghley to get William the post of privy-chamberlain to Queen Elizabeth.[22] Nearly thirty years later William was using his influence with one of the younger Cecils in behalf of Henry.[23] After William had become privy-chamberlain, he found his own means for advancement. He received from Elizabeth the rights to farm the seals of the Queen's Bench,[24] and the undertaking was so lucrative that William was in a fair way to amass a fortune, and his privilege was granted to subsequent applicants at a high rental. Courtiers in the reign of Queen Elizabeth were not suffered to be purely ornamental. William was used by his mistress as a confidential agent and minor diplomatist. When the Queen was vacillating concerning the fate of Mary Queen of Scots, William acted as her

[20] Among his relatives by marriage were members of the families of Trelawny, Reynell, Lower, Mohun, and Seymour. *D. N. B.*, XXXI, 107.

[21] Edward Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England,* 7 vols., Oxford, 1849, III, 414; IV, 235. *The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon Written by Himself,* 2 vols., Oxford, 1857, I, 117.

[22] H. H. Drake, *op. cit.*, p. xii.

[23] *Historical MSS Commission,* MSS. of the Marquis of Salisbury, K. G. (or Cecil MSS), Part xi (1906), p. 271.

[24] *Landsdowne MSS,* Burghley Papers, xxv, 100–107.

go-between with her councilors of state.[25] He was also employed as a shipping commissioner, and was associated in business and social life with Drake, Hawkins, and other famous English sea-dogs. As shipping commissioner he was overworked, so that he too had to solicit his chief to relieve him of some of his duties. He explained that the going in and out of ships had caused a "flux" to descend into his leg, and described his malady in such terms that the curious modern student can rest assured that the poor man was actually suffering from what we know as "housemaid's knee."[26] There is no evidence that William shared the artistic interests of his brother Henry, although several literary works, devotional in character, are dedicated to him and his wife Margaret. One of these is the English translation of John Fox's *Christ Jesus Triumphant,* and it seems to point to the nature of its patron's religious allegiance. Concerning his character we can only determine that he seemed to be worthily esteemed in his own day. He shared one Killigrew weakness which existing records do not attach to his brother. He had a taste for splendor which made him acquire a tentative hold on estates too large for his means to support, and before he died in 1622 he was complaining to the Earl of Dorset that he could scarcely live because his allow-

[25] *Historical MSS Commission,* 4th Report, Part 1 (1874), p. 340. William was sent by Elizabeth to ask for the order for Queen Mary's execution, but before he arrived it was passed under the great seal. Perhaps the messenger loitered on his way, knowing how to obey his mistress's inclination rather than her expressed commands.

[26] His letter dated Aug. 20, 1596 is addressed to Robert Cecil. Cf. *Historical MSS Commission,* MSS of the Marquis of Salisbury, Part vi (1895), p. 343.

ance from the King was no more than enough to make payments on old debts.[27] Almost to his death he represented various Cornish boroughs in Parliament, and there is evidence that he did not use his vote simply to purchase royal favor. The same Cornishman who praised his brother seems to voice the opinion of William's constituents when he says:

> We were beholden to Sir Walter Raleghs earnest writing (who was then in the Countrey), to Sir Henry Killegrews sound advice, and to Master William Killegrews paineful soliciting (being the most kinde patrone of all his Countrey and Countreymens affairs at Court.) [28]

William and his son Robert were knighted by King James in 1603. His daughters, like those of his brother Henry, married fashionably, and his son became the father of a family distinguished diversely in literary, historical, and social ways.

Robert Killigrew, father of Thomas Killigrew the dramatist, fell heir to most of Sir William's offices and employments. He added new ones to them and thus set a precedent for the future employment of his children. As a member of Parliament he represented the County of Cornwall in 1625 and six different Cornish boroughs between 1601 and 1629.[29] He was a violent supporter of the royal interests in Parliament, and on Aug. 11, 1625, he attempted to save the new King chagrin by moving that the question concerning a supply be not put, "for it is a greater disgrace to be

[27] *Historical MSS Commission,* 4th Report, Part 1 (1874), p. 302.
[28] Richard Carew, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
[29] Thomas Seccombe, *D. N. B.*, XXXI, 110.

denyed by a fewe than by all."[30] There is evidence that he too did not entirely neglect the interests of his countrymen in Cornwall, for after his appointment to the governorship of Pendennis Castle, which occurred in 1614, he did his best to induce the government to improve the fort and provide for the comfort of its soldiers.[31] Unquestionably, however, his chief energies were exerted in using his position at court to gather perquisites for himself and his children. His court career was most successful. He had been involved in the trial of Somerset for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury. Killigrew was a friend of Overbury, and since one of his numerous activities was concocting drugs and cordials for his fellow courtiers, he had provided certain powders for the imprisoned author. Somerset deposed that it was one of these powders that had caused Overbury's death. Killigrew defended himself by a denial which, of course, injured the case of the accused.[32] Whether his connection with the trial of Somerset had anything to do with it or not, it is impossible to say, but he suffered no neglect in court, and enjoyed the intermittent friendship of the all-powerful Buckingham. In 1618 he was made prothonotary of Chancery for life. In March, 1627, he was receiving

[30] *Camden Society Publications,* "Debates in the House of Commons in 1625," S. R. Gardner, Ed., 1873, p. 122.

[31] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1627–28, p. 15.

[32] These facts are commonly known, but anyone interested in the fascinating mystery surrounding Overbury's death might inquire further into Robert Killigrew's connection with it. His alleged friendship for the author was apparently not shared by his wife, for among some manuscripts on sale at Thorpe's in 1836 was a letter to Lady Killigrew from the Countess of Bedford, desiring to end "Sir Thomas Overberries quarrels and yours." Cf. Boase and Courtney, *op. cit.,* III, 1257.

four pounds a day as ambassador to the United Provinces, although he had been appointed the year before and had not yet entered upon his duties. His prosperity continued after Buckingham's assassination, and by Jan. 2, 1630, he was holding the office of vice-chamberlain to Queen Henrietta Maria.[33] Besides these offices, he received a host of minor grants. The diversity of his business enterprises is amazing. He had vessels sailing under letters of marque, was a charter member of the New River Company, was draining the fens of Lincolnshire, and was lessee of the rights to farm the seals of the King's Bench and Common Pleas.[34]

It is impossible not to admire the energy and ingenuity of this man. Letters which remain to us indicate that he was a shrewd business man, a politic courtier, and, perhaps, that he was not handicapped by more scrupulosity than his fellows. His character was marked by a hot temper which at one time caused a disturbance in the House of Commons, and at another involved him in a duel with Captain Burton, and which contributed perhaps to the enmity which existed between him and Philip Mainwaring and other courtiers.[35] He was withal a cultured man. He had matriculated at Christ Church, Oxford, at the age of eleven, and his

[33] For contemporary mention of these three offices cf. *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1611–18, p. 242; *Ibid.,* 1627–28, p. 15; *Ibid.,* 1629–31, p. 158.

[34] For contemporary mention of these four (purely illustrative) activities cf. *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1628–29, p. 299; *D. N. B.,* XXXI, 110; *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1628–29, 1629–31, 1631–33, *passim; Ibid.,* 1627–28, p. 96, and his will lodged in P. C. C., Somerset House, London, 69 Russell.

[35] Cf. *D. N. B.,* XXXI, 110; *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1611–18, p. 511; *Ibid.,* 1628–29, March 29, 1629.

catholicity of interests throughout life included not only science but literature as well. It is interesting to us that when Constantin Huygens, the Dutch poet, visited London on several occasions, he resided with Sir Robert Killigrew.[36] To this man the learned Thomas Farnaby dedicated his edition of Martial. Many of Sir Robert's traits were duplicated in his son Thomas. Among these may be numbered literary interests, skill as a courtier, business initiative, and a certain extravagance of character.

Some of these characteristics must also have attached to Thomas Killigrew's mother. Sir Robert married Mary Woodhouse, the daughter of Sir Henry Woodhouse of Waxham, Suffolk, by his wife Anne. Anne was the daughter of Lord Keeper Nicholas Bacon, so Thomas Killigrew's mother was the granddaughter of one of those literary Cooke sisters, and the niece of no less a person than the great Francis Bacon.[37] She is said to have been called the "young" or the "French" Lady Killigrew (to distinguish her from her mother-in-law), and it is fairly certain that in spite of her large family her attainments were social rather than domestic. There exists one contemporary characterization of her written by the Countess of Warwick, who speaks of "my old Lady Staford [this was after her second marriage], mother to my sister Boyle [Elizabeth Killigrew], who was a cunning old woman, and who had been herself too much and too long versed in amours. . . ." The pious countess was not the woman to make this

[36] *Notes and Queries,* Fourth Series, VII, 454.

[37] Rev. C. Parkin, *An Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk,* 12 vols., London, 1808, IX, 353.

kind of statement lightly, but we must remember that she was writing of an occasion when her own single, and eminently honorable, love intrigue had been exposed to her father, the Earl of Cork, by the lady in question.[38] We know that although Lady Killigrew remarried soon after Sir Robert's death in 1633, at a time when she was far from young, she continued to take an active interest in the welfare of the children by her first marriage after those children were old enough to take care of themselves. The second husband of Lady Killigrew was Sir Thomas Stafford, illegitimate son of the Earl of Totness in Devon, and a gentleman-usher to Queen Henrietta Maria,[39] so that the step-father as well as the father of the Killigrew children was a courtier about the person of the French Queen.

It is essential for us to notice in what style the father and mother of Thomas Killigrew lived. There is no question but that they lived expensively. Their town house was only rented, and was located in Lothbury, that section of the heart of old London which by the time of Dr. Johnson had become synonymous with "the City." Hard by was the ancient Jewry of St. Olave's. The parish church was St. Margaret's. The community, after the manner of the time, was neither fashionable nor unfashionable. In Rowlands' *A Foole's Bolt is Soone shot* (4°, 1614, p. 9) we hear of "Lothburie where the brassiers do abide," and in Stowe's *Survey of*

[38] *Percy Society Publications,* "Autobiography of Mary Countess of Warwick," T. C. Croker, Ed., London, 1848, p. 9. Further details of the relations of the Killigrews to the famous Boyle family are available in this interesting journal.

[39] *The Gentleman's Magazine,* LXXXII, Part ii, 315.

London, when he discusses Coleman Street Ward, of

> the streete of Lothberie . . . possessed for the most part by Founders, that cast Candlestickes, Chafing dishes, Spice mortars, and such like Copper or Latoon workes, and do afterwarde turne them with the foot & not with the wheele, to make them smooth and bright with turning and scrating (as some do tearme it) making a loathsome noice to the by-passers, that have not been used to the like, and therefore by them disdainedly called Lothberie. On the south side of this street, amongst the founders be some faire houses and large for marchantes. . . .[40]

In one of these "faire houses and large" must have dwelled the Killigrew family, and here Thomas Killigrew was born. But the residence which would have satisfied more completely the polite tastes of Sir Robert and his lady was their country seat in the parish of Hanworth.

Some time before 1594 Queen Elizabeth had granted Sir William Killigrew the Manor of Hanworth for life. In 1594 the Manor of Hanworth, the Park of Hanworth, and the Manor of Cold Kennington were leased to him for eighty years.[41] During the reign of James I, a new lease, rent free, was granted Sir William to the Manor and Park of Hanworth and the Manor and Park of Cold Kennington (alias Kineton or Kempton).[42] Each of these four properties had a house which could be occupied, or perhaps sublet, by the Killigrews. The estates lay in Spelthorne Hundred in very beautiful countryside about fourteen miles southwest from the center of London. The Thames flowed past Kempton

[40] John Stowe, *Survey of London,* C. L. Kingsford, Ed., 2 vols., Oxford, 1908, I, 276.

[41] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1591–94, pp. 547, 559.

[42] *Ibid.,* 1631–33, p. 153.

Park. Kempton and Hanworth were adjacent to each other, and bordering them upon the east was the royal countryseat of Hampton Court. The Killigrew houses themselves not only were crown property but had been royal residences. Henry VIII had given Hanworth Manor and Park to Anne Boleyn in 1532, and to Katherine Parr in 1544. The Princess Elizabeth at the age of fifteen had come to live with Katherine at Hanworth Park, and here were enacted the incredible incidents of that affair between the future queen and Thomas Seymour.[43] There can be no question of the spaciousness and elegance of at least one of these properties. Queen Elizabeth spent several days at her old home at Hanworth in 1600 while the estate was in the hands of Sir William Killigrew.[44] In 1603 Robert Killigrew was knighted there by King James. An interesting glimpse of the place and its inhabitants is given us on the occasion of another royal visit when King James stopped at Hanworth and

> . . . there saw the designment of a fine ground, a pretty lodge, a gracious lady, a fair maid, the daughter and a fine bouquet. He saw the pools, the deer and the herondry, which was his errand.[45]

Thomas Killigrew and his brothers and sisters must have spent much of their childhood and youth at the countryseat at Hanworth. Although Thomas was born in London, most of the others were born at Hanworth

[43] *Victoria History of the Counties of England, Middlesex,* 1911, II, 393.
[44] *Ibid.,* p. 395.
[45] Conway to Buckingham, 3 May, 1623. Cf. W. H. Tregellas, *op. cit.,* p. 155.

and were baptized in the parish church.[46] It must be remembered that although the Killigrews could enjoy these ancient and genteel premises, fit for peers of the realm, they did not own them; and one of the conditions of their lease was that 300 head of deer be maintained there "for his Majesty's disport." The expense of living on such a grand scale may account for Sir William's financial difficulties. Sir Robert in prosperous times in 1626 did attempt to purchase Kempton,[47] having relinquished to Lord Cottington the remainder of the lease to Hanworth at his father's death. Nothing evidently came of the attempt, but in 1631 he managed to provide for his family's future possession by securing the grant of Kempton Manor and Park in fee farm and in reversion.[48] The rental was the nominal sum of £15, 1 s. a year, and the property passed on to his heirs. Of course with the advent of the Civil Wars, Kempton went the way of other royal grants and sinecures. Other properties of Sir Robert,[49] his estate at Crediton in Devon, Launceston in Cornwall, the advowson to the Rectory of Heston, his reclaimed fen lands in Lincolnshire, may have contributed to a feeling of family grandeur, but they were heavily encumbered, or rights to them were contested, so that in war times

[46] Rev. Daniel Lysons, *The Environs of London*, 6 vols., 1796–1811, V, 99. Extracts from the parish register, and other interesting information, are furnished in this work.

[47] *Cal. State Papers Domestic*, 1625–26, p. 454.

[48] *Ibid.*, 1631–33, p. 153.

[49] Cf. Sir Robert Killigrew's will, P. C. C., Somerset House, London, 69 Russell. The difficulties Sir Robert met in asserting his claim to the fen lands, and other of these possessions, is indicated by numerous references in the calendared state papers.

Sir Robert's heirs saw them follow the countryseat into the limbo of remembered magnificence.

Although we are primarily concerned with the career of the fourth son of Sir Robert Killigrew, certain aspects of his life can only be understood after sparing a glance at the careers of his brothers and sisters. Of the twelve children of Sir Robert and Lady Mary five sons and four daughters lived to maturity.[50] One of the sons, Charles, died before he was twenty-three, and another, Robert, is a shadowy figure of whom we know only that he took a degree at Oxford, and while there wrote Latin verses.[51] The other brothers and sisters are all distinct figures and all lived interesting lives. A representative of the older branch of the family, writing at a time when both branches were in their final decline, makes this interesting comment:

(Sir Robert Killigrew had) several younger sons making great figures in the world, and four fine daughters, famed for their wit and beauty, and from thence preferred in marriage . . . the said younger sons of the said Sir Robert making their way at Court by

[50] These facts are supplied by family wills. The grandmother Margerie Killigrew's will, dated 22 May, 1623 (P. C. C., 71 Clarke) enumerates the older children then living, and Sir Robert's will, dated 12 Sept., 1632 (P. C. C., 69 Russell) provides a later list which we may assume was complete, because to the children he names, and to them only, there are subsequent references. The approximate date and the place of birth of the children are supplied by the parish registers of Hanworth and Lothbury, the one abstracted by D. Lysons, *op cit.*, and the other referred to by J. L. Chester, *op. cit.*

[51] He took his B. A. at Christ Church, Oxford, 10 June, 1630. Cf. J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses,* 4 vols., Oxford, 1891, II, 849. His verses are contained in *Britanniae Natalis,* Oxoniae, 1630, 4°. His career has been amalgamated with two other Robert Killigrews, the sons respectively of his brothers, Thomas and William (G. C. Boase, *Collectanea Cornubiensia,* Truro, 1890, p. 455), but there is actually no reference to him after 1630.

their wit, which for want of prudence, was the ruin of the second branch of this family. . . .[52]

This statement while true in the main does not properly apply to all of Sir Robert's children. The lives of some of Thomas's brothers and sisters were marked by no particular imprudences. What is more interesting to us in the present instance, however, is the invariable connection of these brothers and sisters with the court. Anne Killigrew, eldest sister of Thomas, was the first wife of George Kirke, afterwards groom of the bedchamber to Charles I. She herself was a dresser to Queen Henrietta Maria, and while attending upon her Majesty in 1641 fell from the royal barge near London Bridge and was drowned. She was buried in Westminster Abbey,[53] and her elegy was written by Henry Glapthorne. Her sister Katherine also attended upon royalty. In 1646 Prince Charles wrote to his aunt, the Queen of Bohemia, asking her to take Lady Stafford's daughter, Kate Killigrew, as a maid of honor.[54] The request must have been granted in a fashion, for a mistress Killigrew became maid of honor to her niece, the Princess Royal of Orange, and died of the smallpox at the Spa in 1654. The Queen of Bohemia expressed

[52] "The Family of Killigrew:" See above, note 1. A more famous contemporary of the Martin Killigrew who made this statement describes this generation as "remarkable for its loyalty, accomplishments, and wit," but mentions nothing about a lack of prudence. (Cf. Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting*, London, 1849, II, 456.)

[53] J. L. Chester, *The Marriage, Baptismal and Burial Registers of the Collegiate Church or Abbey of St. Peter, Westminster*, London, 1876, p. 135. See also Henry Glapthorne, *Whitehall, a poem* . . . , 4°, 1643; reprinted in *Plays and Poems of Henry Glapthorne*, J. Pearson, Ed., London, 1874, p. 232.

[54] G. C. Boase & W. P. Courtney, *op. cit.*, III, 1257.

her regrets on the occasion observing that "Killigrewe" was "a verie good gentlewoman."[55] It is interesting to notice that the post thus left vacant was filled by Edward Hyde's daughter, and that she made such good use of her opportunities that she became the wife of the Duke of York, afterwards James II.[56] It is not difficult to imagine that with a person like Prince James at large, a sister of Thomas Killigrew (had she not proved a *verie* good gentlewoman) might have become a Queen of England. Mary Killigrew, the youngest of the sisters, apparently held no court position. However she became the wife of a courtier, Sir John James, descended from "the ancient lords of Haestricht in Holland," and at her death in 1677 was buried in Westminster Abbey.[57] Her senior by one year, Elizabeth Killigrew, had the most notable court career of all. Born in 1622 in Lothbury, she was eleven years younger than her brother Thomas. She became a maid of honor to Queen Henrietta Maria, and in 1638 married Francis Boyle, fourth son of the Earl of Cork and younger brother to Roger Boyle (later Lord Orrery), the dramatist and romancer. Robert Boyle, another member of this distinguished family, comments upon his brother's marriage and refers to Elizabeth as "a maid of honour, both young and hand-

[55] Queen of Bohemia to Sir Edward Nicholas, Hague, Aug. 31, 1654. The letter is printed in *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn, F. R. S. to which is subjoined The Private Correspondence between Charles I and Sir Edward Nicholas*, etc., W. Bray, Ed., 4 vols., London, 1870, IV, 206.

[56] *The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon written by Himself*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1857, I, 258–62.

[57] J. L. Chester, *op. cit.*, p. 192. Mary also went into exile during the Interregnum. Cf. *Cal. State Papers Domestic*, 1649–50, pp. 532, 556.

some."[58] Elizabeth's sister-in-law, Mary Boyle, the future Countess of Warwick, tells how:

> My brother being then judged too young to live with his wife, was a day or two after celebrating the marriage (which was done before the King and Queen) at Whitehall (she being then a maid of honour to the Queen) sent into France to travel, and his wife then brought home to our house. . . .[59]

Francis returned from his travels several years later and he and Elizabeth had several children. Later still the family joined Charles II in exile, and Elizabeth became the second mistress of that young libertine. She bore him his second natural child, "Charlotte Jemima Henrietta Maria," who later became by marriage the Countess of Yarmouth.[60] Although the mother received some slight favors from the King after his restoration, it is doubtful if her daughter was ever recognized. She continued to live with Francis Boyle who became Lord Shannon. She will be referred to again, as she was the favorite sister of Thomas Killigrew, one of whose last requests was that he be buried as near to her as possible in Westminster Abbey.

The three remaining children of Sir Robert Killigrew, William, Thomas, and Henry, all lived to an advanced age, all were courtiers, and all belong to the history of English drama. Although materials are available for fairly full biographies of Thomas's brothers, only their

[58] The reference occurs in Robert Boyle's journal kept under the name of Philaretus. Cf. *Percy Society Publications, op. cit.*, pp. 43–45.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[60] Anthony à Wood, *Fasti Oxonienses*, Philip Bliss, Ed., London, 1815, Part II, p. 269. See also for details concerning Elizabeth and her daughter (both of whom were buried in Westminster Abbey) J. L. Chester, *op. cit.*, pp. 200, 210.

court and dramatic careers can be suggested here.[61] William was the eldest son. He was partner to his father's many projects and succeeded to them at his father's death. He proved an unmanageable governor of Pendennis Castle[62] (a post he relinquished before the Civil Wars), and a plunger in the adventure of draining the fen lands. Like most public improvements this draining was opposed, the natives of Lincolnshire suffering no illusions concerning whom the project would benefit. Although their demonstrations were suppressed before the Civil Wars, the outbreak of that conflict gave them their opportunity to annex the lands improved by the draining.[63] William had sunk the entire patrimony of his father in this project, and had incurred vast debts so that he actually lived in want until the time of the Restoration.[64] His career on the whole

[61] Contemporary notices of these brothers were written by Anthony à Wood: Cf. *Athenae Oxonienses,* Philip Bliss, Ed., 4 vols., London, 1813–20, IV, 694 *seq.* Notices also occur in *D. N. B.,* XXXI, 108 *seq.*

[62] William was very anxious to preserve the prerogatives of Pendennis against the rival actions of St. Mawes. One of his tactics was to send an occasional cannon shot into the rival fort, a procedure which the Lords of the Admiralty objected to. Cf. *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1631–33, pp. 177, 187 *et passim.*

[63] Records of the controversy over these fen lands occur throughout the calendared state papers of the middle and late seventeenth century. The natives of Lincolnshire considered that their commons rights were infringed upon; the best statement of their case occurs in *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1640–41, p. 308. Sir William and his associates were acting by the authority of royal patents, and were actually investing a fortune in the draining; the best statement of their side of the controversy occurs in *Historical MSS Commission,* VIIth Report (1879), Appendix, Part I, p. 129. Both sides printed tracts and distributed them, and some of these still exist.

[64] See a series of rather pathetic letters he wrote to Captain Adam Baynes: printed in *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquarians of London,* Series I, III, 257–61.

was quite honorable. He was knighted by James I in 1626, and created Doctor of Civil Laws at Oxford by Charles I in 1642. He became Captain of one of the troops of horse guarding the person of Charles I during the Civil Wars. There exists an interesting letter written to him by that Monarch:

Will Killigrew

Your suite unto me that I would conferre upon Mr. Arundell of Trevise Eldest sonne the reversion after his father of the government of Pendennis Castle which I had formerly bestowed upon you, is so great a testimonye of your affection to my service & of your preferring the good of that before any Interest of your owne that I have thought fitt to lett you knowe in this particular way, how well I like it & that my conferring that place according to your desire shall bee an earnest upon you of my intentions to recompense & reward you in a better (kinde?)

Oxford the 12th, Jan: 1643

Your assured frend
Charles R.[65]

Sir William was exceedingly proud of this letter, and sent it to Charles II along with a lengthy letter of very politic advice at the time when the Restoration was in prospect.[66] His purpose he stated quite frankly was partly that he be not forgotten in the halcyon days to come. Sir William's true friend after the Restoration was Henrietta Maria. His wife became dresser to the Queen-mother, and, most interesting to us, Sir William began to write plays of the kind that the Queen-mother liked, even though the type was antiquated at this time. These plays written between 1662 and 1666 are mostly

[65] This letter was privately possessed in 1875 and was printed in S. P. Oliver, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

[66] *A Collection of State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq.*, Thomas Birch, Ed., 7 vols., London, 1742, VII, 888.

tragi-comedies, in the same general category as those which his brother Thomas had written some twenty-five years before when Henrietta Maria was young. Owing perhaps to William's Oxford training, his plays have a more literary savor than his brother's, but they are not very absorbing productions, and only one or two of them were suffered to appear on the Restoration stage.[67] The author's friends imputed the failure of his plays upon the stage to the fact that they were too decent for the prevailing taste of the times, and this may be partly the case. Some interesting commendatory verse by "T. L." prefixed to the editions of his plays runs:

> That thy wise and modest Muse
> Flees the Stage's looser use;
> Not bawdy Wit does falsely name,
> And to move laughter put off shame:
>
> That thy theatre's loud noise
> May be virgin's chaste applause;
> And the stoled matron, grave divine,
> Their lectures done, may tend to thine.[68]

Unfortunately the "stoled matron" and the "grave divine" constituted a very minor element in the Restoration audience, and Sir William Killigrew forsook the

[67] The Plays are *Selindra, Pandora, or the Converts, Ormasdes, or Love and Friendship*, Folio, 1664; and *The Seege of Urbin*, Folio, 1666. There is no record that the last two of these plays were acted. The others appear to have been acted about 1662 at Thomas Killigrew's Theatre Royal. A fifth play, *The Imperial Tragedy*, largely translated from the Latin and published in folio, 1669, has been ascribed to Sir William Killigrew on the authority of both Langbaine and Anthony à Wood.

[68] This verse, several more stanzas of which exist, was reprinted by Charles Lamb in his extracts from the Garrick plays. Cf. *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets*, 2 vols., London, 1835, II, 322.

field. Not very successful as a dramatist, he was only moderately successful as a courtier. Although he acquired the office by this time traditional in his family, vice-chamberlain to the Queen (Catherine of Portugal, wife of Charles II), he received nothing like the grants and emoluments given his younger brother Thomas. He continued to strive, as did his children after him, to assert his claims to the lands in Lincolnshire, but without success. He died penniless in 1695 at the age of eighty-nine.[69] Sir William's activity as a dramatist synchronizes pretty closely with Queen Henrietta Maria's brief stay in England after the Restoration. Later he wrote no more plays, but in his advancing years he published several books devotional in character.[70] In one of these aphoristic collections is the remark that "Piety is the Best Policy," but so sincere is the almost evangelical tone of the author that one does not feel that he wrote for this reason.

Of the two younger prominent sons of Sir Robert Killigrew Henry was the only one supplied with the means to support himself independent of the court. He was younger than Thomas by one year, and was bred to the Church. He is spared in the general condemnation of the Killigrews by the commentator already referred to. After the slur upon his brothers and sisters, the latter adds:

[69] See his will, P. C. C., Somerset House, London, Irby 152.

[70] *The Artless Midnight Thoughts of a Gentleman at Court, who for many years built on sand, which every Blast of Cross Fortune defaced but now has laid New Foundations on the Rock of his Salvation* . . . etc., London, Printed for Thomas Hawkins, in the George Yard in Lombard Street, 1684. Several editions and augmentations of this work exist.

. . . still excepting with just regard to his memory, Henry, one of the youngest Sons of the said Sir Robert, bred to the Church and of great Esteem therein, Governor to the Earl of Devonshire's son, since by King Wm., created Duke of Devonshire, also Preceptor of the late Duke of York, King James the 2nd, by style Dr. Killegrew, Master of the Savoy and Prebend of Westminster, who had two sons Henry & James, both bred to the sea.[71]

To these biographical details it is necessary to add that Henry wrote one play. It is a tragi-comedy, and a courtier's play, written about 1634, to celebrate the nuptials of the Duke of Buckingham's only daughter, Lady Mary Villiers, and Charles Herbert, eldest son of the Earl of Pembroke. Later it was produced upon the public stage and is said to have won great approbation. It is rather difficult for the modern reader to understand this, but it must be remembered that the author was claimed to be only seventeen, and was certainly not more than twenty-one, when the play was written. One song from it was thought worthy to be included among Charles Lamb's dramatic extracts.[72] Henry was created a Doctor of Divinity by Charles I at Oxford in 1642. He accompanied the Duke of York in exile and became a member of the "cabinet councele" which determined that Prince's movements during the

[71] "The Family of Killigrew:" See above, note 1.

[72] The play was printed as *The Conspiracy* in an unauthorized quarto in 1638. The author's edition appeared as *Pallantus and Eudora*, Folio, 1653. An alteration of the play called *The Tyrant King of Crete* appears in *Sir Chas. Sedley's Works*, London, 1722, II, 317 *seq.* It is discussed by Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, Oxford, 1691, p. 309; and by F. G. Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama 1559–1642*, 2 vols., London, 1891, II, 22. For the song referred to, cf. Lamb, *op. cit.*, II, 486.

Civil Wars and the early part of the Interregnum.[73] But whereas the Queen-mother had no objection to the secular Killigrews and could favor them in their attendance upon herself and her children, she apparently could not extend the same favor to a Killigrew who was a pillar in the Anglican church. It is probable that the separation of Henry from the Duke of York during the last years of the Exile was a part of Henrietta Maria's pious machinations. At the Restoration Henry did serve as the Duke's almoner, and his wife attended upon the Duchess,[74] but his chief reward for faithfulness was the Mastership of the Savoy. He gained this post in competition with the poet Cowley,[75] and Charles II took advantage of his appointee by infringing upon the rights of that ancient hospital.[76] But whatever concessions Dr. Killigrew may have been forced to make to his monarch, he served at the Savoy conscientiously, as he seems to have done in all the other offices entrusted to him. Evidence survives, moreover, of his studious and literary interests. The relations among the Killigrew brothers were not close, but Thomas does refer in one of his plays to this brother: "he's a serious black fellow, he smells like Serge and

[73] No reference is made to Henry's career in exile in existing notices, but information may be found in *Camden Society Publications,* "The Nicholas Papers," G. F. Warner, Ed., 1886–97, I, 195, 198; *Historical MSS Commission,* MSS of the Marquess of Bath (1907), II, 97; and elsewhere among contemporary documents.

[74] *Historical MSS Commission,* 8th Report, Appendix, Part I, p. 278.

[75] "Savoy missing Cowley" occurs among the *State Poems.* Cf. H. B. Wheatley & P. Cunningham, *London Past and Present,* 3 vols., London, 1891, III, 218.

[76] *Cal. of Treasury Papers,* 1667–68, p. 227.

old Books. . . ."[77] There exist besides his play editions of a number of sermons which he preached before King Charles; and attributed to him are anonymous translations of the *Epigrams* of Martial.[78] He died at the Savoy, March 9, 1699/1700, aged eighty-seven. His two sons were notable figures in the British navy; and that paragon of virtue, Anne Killigrew, poet and painter, was his daughter. This estimable lady died young "to the unspeakable reluctancy of her relations,"[79] and John Dryden celebrated her death in that familiar ode which Dr. Johnson, probably more moved by the reputation for beauty and piety of its subject than by the poem itself, called the noblest in the language. In the eighteenth century Anne Killigrew became a tradition for her virtues just as her uncle, Thomas, became a tradition for his vices—it is to be hoped that in the former case it was with more justice than in the latter.

It is impossible to devote more space to Thomas Killigrew's family. A number of his cousins were also notable courtiers, and some of their names have already been indicated. One sister of Sir Robert Killigrew married Sir Maurice Berkeley and another married Sir Thomas Jermyn, so that Henry Jermyn, to whose relations with Henrietta Maria so much scandal has unjustly attached, and Sir William Berke-

[77] *Thomaso or The Wanderer,* Part I, Act V., Scene 1. Thomaso in the play is Thomas Killigrew, and the character described here is Thomaso's brother.

[78] W. C. Hazlitt, *Handbook,* Third Series, London, 1887, p. 132; and Edward Arber, *Term Catalogues,* 3 vols., London, 1903–06, III, Index.

[79] Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses,* 4 vols., Philip Bliss, Ed., London, 1813–20, IV, 623.

ley, dramatist and first Governor of Virginia, were Thomas Killigrew's first cousins.[80] To these may be added the influential relatives of his first wife, the numerous Crofts, and a number of friends who will be referred to in later chapters. Not only was Thomas Killigrew a courtier himself by natural talents and family tradition but he moved in a *milieu* the very existence of which was bound up with that of the Stuart family.

Commentators on the career of Thomas Killigrew have been wrong in attributing his influence with Charles II to any discreditable services he may have been willing to perform. As personal attendant upon the King, and as royal ambassador, he was simply enjoying offices his father and grandfather had enjoyed before him. England was the land of precedent even down to the distributing of minor court employments. It is interesting that the eldest son should have been appointed vice-chamberlain to the Queen for four generations in this younger branch of the Killigrew family. In many ways this family illustrates the curious social usages of the time. A daughter of Robert Killigrew became mistress to the King while a son preached eloquent sermons to him at Whitehall; another son fought his battles in England while a third, as we shall see, borrowed money for him and amused

[80] These relationships are established by Margerie Killigrew's will. (See note 50) which like the wills of most amiable grandmothers is an excellent genealogy in itself. *D. N. B.*, IV, 361, 368, incorrectly states that Sir William Berkeley's mother was the daughter of Sir Henry Killigrew. Other minor errors concerning the Killigrews occur in that work, and are not noted in the present study.

him while he danced away his time in exile. The names of so many personages in high place must be introduced in discussing this family of courtiers that one is apt to overestimate its importance. For all their conspicuous employments, their style of living, their wide circle of influential acquaintances, the Killigrews were never more than minor figures about the court. The reason for this is readily explained. However ancient the family may have been in the remote and rugged county of Cornwall, in England they were still parvenus. Their estates, as has been pointed out, were mostly held in fee farm as royal favors, and therefore resembled fairy gold—apt to disappear upon an awakening. What the family really lacked was ownership of those broad and reasonably unencumbered acres which made for solidity and genuine influence. With a little prudence and good fortune this landed property might have been acquired. The lack of true ancestral prestige could have been spared owing to the new social usages which James I brought with him to England. When Thomas Killigrew's eldest brother was born, his chances were about equal of becoming a peer of the realm or a buffeted hanger-on about the court.[81] Neither he nor his brothers and sisters had the kind of family name or family wealth which could be leaned upon for a successful career.

[81] Of course the career of William was vitally affected by the outbreak of the Civil Wars. This was the "awakening," and Pym and the hard-headed parliamentarians proved the nemesis of many more than King Charles I. What is true of William is not so true of his brothers and sisters, for they could become courtiers in exile with about the same chance of success or failure in life as if the court had remained at home.

They had to be active. They had to employ to the full all the personal charm and native talent they possessed. Their real inheritance from their father was prerogative to be employed in court positions. A common impression of the courtier pictures him as an ornamental figure haunting the royal precincts in order to occupy his leisure. But this does not seem to have been the case. Certainly with a Killigrew, to be gentleman-usher to the King or vice-chamberlain to the Queen was his traditional profession and often his sole means of support. Whatever opportunity might offer of attracting attention and strengthening a hold on royal favor, we might expect him to employ. This would be especially true of a younger son in a large family. In a word, Thomas Killigrew, like many of his relatives and friends, was exactly of that group which could be expected to take up the new-fangled method of gaining a reputation by writing plays. And those plays would naturally be a reflection of courtly tastes, more specifically, of the tastes of a royal master, or—as may be demonstrated in this instance—of a royal mistress.

II

A YOUNGER SON

TO have had three older brothers must have seemed nothing short of calamitous to Thomas Killigrew as soon as he was old enough to realize that his father's position at Hanworth was midway between that of a proprietor and that of a caretaker. It would be interesting for us to have full information concerning our dramatist's youth and his early experiences in winning a place for himself, but, as must be expected, this is the period of his life about which we can learn the least. His career upon the whole can be reconstructed more completely than those of many literary figures of his time who were of much greater importance, and this is true even of his early years. Concerning the place and date of his birth we have a statement from the author himself, specific enough to be startling:

> I was born in Loth berrey in London, Febbruarey the 7 1611 being a friday at 3 in the morning
>
> Thomas Killigrew [1] [The date here is Old Style.]

The parish register of St. Margaret's church in Lothbury contains the record of his baptism, which took place on the 20th of the same month.[2] In February of

[1] This entry was made by Thomas Killigrew in his family Bible, *La Sacra Biblia, tradotta in lingua Italiana da Giovanni Diodati,* folio, 1640. It was on sale by Ellis and White in 1872, and the entries made in Killigrew's hand were copied by R. N. Worth and printed in *Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica,* J. J. Howard, Ed., New Series, I, 370.

[2] J. L. Chester, *op. cit.,* p. 207.

the following year his brother Henry was born, and was baptized not in London but at Hanworth; and in July of the year following this, Charles, the sixth son in this family, was likewise baptized at Hanworth.[3] It is fairly safe to assume from this evidence that Thomas Killigrew's early childhood was spent at Hanworth. Sir Robert's business enterprises must have kept him in London most of the time, but while his children were growing up, it is probable that his family was usually left in the country. It is even possible to make a safe conjecture concerning the identity of some of Thomas's early playmates. Sir Robert's sister and her husband, Sir Maurice Berkeley, were settled at Hanworth, probably through the provision of Sir William Killigrew, and the Hanworth parish register indicates that this pair was bringing a family of boys into the world during the same period and at almost as frequent intervals as Sir Robert and Lady Mary.[4] The five Berkeley boys were all ultimately knighted, and with some of them Thomas had contacts in later years. The most famous of them, William Berkeley, was only two and a half years older than his cousin Thomas, and must have been intimately associated with him in boyhood. Thomas's cousins and his several brothers of about his own age would have kept his childhood from being lonely; and when we put this group of boys in the setting of the country estate with its heronry and deer-park, and its nearness to the Thames, we get a rather clear and very pleasant picture of what our dramatist's boyhood must have been.

[3] Daniel Lysons, *op. cit.*, V, 99.
[4] *Ibid.*, V, 101.

But Thomas did not spend all of his boyhood in the country. Our most interesting bit of testimony concerning his early years evokes a picture in curious contrast to the one at Hanworth. On October 30, 1662, Samuel Pepys went home and wrote in his diary that he "would not forget two passages of Sir J. Minnes's at yesterday's dinner;" one of these was of

> Thos. Killigrew's way of getting to see plays when he was a boy. He would go to the Red Bull, and when the man cried to the boys, 'Who will go and be a devil, and he shall see the play for nothing?' then would he go in and be a devil upon the stage, and so get to see plays.[5]

It is interesting to have this evidence of our future patentee's early interest in the theatre,[6] but it is even more interesting to notice that he got his entertainment "for nothing" by a means analogous to that of the modern boy who waters the circus elephants. We have pictured Thomas as living the life of the children of landed gentry. Here we see him in the guise of a truant apprentice. The two pictures act upon each other as excellent correctives. Sir Robert was busily building up a position for his family, but that position had not been thoroughly secured. His children were too numerous, and his time and means were too limited, for him to hot-house their existence. It would not be too much to say that according to our standards they

[5] *Pepys' Diary*, October 30, 1662.

[6] The Red Bull was within less than a half hour's walking distance of the Killigrew house in Lothbury, for it was situated across the city to the northwest, at the upper end of St. John Street in the parish of St. James, Clerkenwell. Cf. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, Oxford, 1923, II, 445–48. One may remark that if any theatre were still having frequent use for "devils" late in the reign of James, that theatre was the Red Bull.

may even have suffered periodic neglect. In this connection we may well inquire concerning the education of the particular one in whom we are interested, and we shall find our conclusion to be that it was so grossly neglected that Thomas Killigrew lived his life a comparatively uneducated man.

Anthony à Wood has said:

> Thomas Killigrew . . . [was] . . . not educated at any university (and therefore wanted some learning to poise his excellent natural parts) but in the royal court, where he was page of honour to king Charles I. . . .[7]

The commendatory verse prefixed to the 1641 duodecimo of two of his plays seems to indicate that Thomas had missed something more than university training. "H. Benet" (the future Earl of Arlington) addressing himself "To His Most Honour'd Uncle" writes:

> I cannot choose but wonder how your Parts
> Gained this perfection without Bookes, or Arts . . .

Will Cartwright, the dramatist, strikes the same note:

> You have not what diverts some Men from sense,
> Those two Mysterious things, Greeke and Pretence: [8]

[7] Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses,* IV, 692. Wood may have acquired his information concerning the Killigrews by direct application to them. On Oct. 17, 1691, he addressed a letter of inquiry to Dr. Henry Killigrew. Cf. *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood,* A. Clark, Ed., Oxford, 1891–1900, III, 350.

[8] Cf. *The Prisoners* and *Claracilla,* 12°, 1641. Rob. Waring also contributed to the interesting verse in English and Latin prefixed to these plays. The three writers, as Wood points out, were all Masters of Arts at Christ Church, Oxford, the college of Thomas's father and two of his brothers. Henry Bennet was the son of Sir John Bennet and Dorothy Crofts (*D. N. B.,* IV, 230) so that he was actually the nephew of Killigrew's first wife. In later years he became a political power, and will be referred to in subsequent chapters.

The playwright himself has left a statement concerning his education which is more emphatic than any of the above. In the Epilogue to *The Parson's Wedding* he inserts references to

> . . . the illiterate Courtier that made this Play;

and a few lines further on he describes that courtier as

> . . . one that can scarce read, nay, not his own hand.[9]

Of course this is exaggeration, and it is necessary to make certain discounts owing to the pose of ignorance popular among fashionable young gentlemen of the day. Killigrew has commented on this pose, and in this same comedy one of the characters consents to go to a play providing the author

> . . . be none of our Gentleman Poets, that excuse their writings with a Prologue that professes they are no scholars.[10]

Nevertheless the term "illiterate" as attached to Thomas Killigrew is little more than descriptive, and a number of documents in his hand have come down to us to prove the point. Any difficulties he himself may have had in reading his hand are eclipsed by those of the modern reader who attempts the same feat. His manuscripts must have provided ample exercise for his printers. We are on delicate ground when we criticize the orthography of anyone of this period; still a certain uniformity marked the practice of those who had progressed beyond the more elementary stages of education. Killigrew's spelling is extravagant beyond all parallels. In recording the births of his children in his

[9] See the conclusion to Act V, Scene 4, p. 154 in the folio, 1664.
[10] Act III, Scene 2, Folio, 1664, p. 110.

family Bible, he never spelled the simple word "son" twice the same, and upon one occasion he arrived at the true achievement "suenne."[11] The few tag ends of text-book Latin which occur in several of his plays are inserted with a waggish comment by the author that they are probably bad.

It is pretty certain that Thomas Killigrew's education was received through a hit-and-miss process completed at home, and in a grammar school. He has put this interesting speech in the mouth of one of his characters:

> A pox upon my Nurse, she frighted me so when I was young with stories of the Devil, I was almost fourteen er'e I could prevail with Reasons to unbind my Reason, it was so slav'd to Faith and Conscience; . . .[12]

Probably the author's childhood had not been without religious training. Anthony à Wood has said that Henry Killigrew "was educated in grammar learning under Mr. Tho. Farnaby, in the parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate, London."[13] Since Henry and Thomas were within a year of the same age, it is not unlikely that Thomas also went to Farnaby's school. This notable scholar was famous as a teacher, but since his pupils sometimes numbered several hundred and he never employed more than a few ushers,[14] it would not

[11] The Killigrew Bible, see above, note 1.

[12] *The Parson's Wedding*, Act II, Scene 7, Folio, 1664, p. 102. The Captain who makes this speech seems occasionally to be the mouthpiece for the author. The words "almost fourteen" are significant, because they describe the age at which Killigrew probably left home to become a courtier: see below.

[13] Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, IV, 621.

[14] *D. N. B.*, XVIII, 217.

be remarkable if he failed to make a complete success of every product.

What Killigrew may have lacked in academic training he made up for by his "natural parts," and by his training in court. He was naturally quick, as his contemporary reputation for wit indicates, and he was imaginative. He seems to have read a great deal. His plays, besides their reminiscences of older and contemporary drama, contain Biblical allusions, many classical allusions (frequently garbled), and reveal a familiar acquaintance with such works as *The Arcadia, The Faery Queene,* and the old metrical romances. While his reading must have been largely of the "light" variety, he seems also to have read considerable history and pseudo-history. Of course he read the prose romances popular in his day. Romance reading is alluded to in his plays, and such evidence as Dorothy Osborne's *Letters* indicates how great the furor for them became in courtly circles. Testimony involving the Killigrew family more closely is provided by the *Journal* of the Countess of Warwick, who tells how Elizabeth Killigrew, after being brought to the Boyle house to live,

> . . . she and I became chamber fellows, and constant bedfellows; and there grew so great a kindness between us, that she soon had a great and ruling power with me; and by her having so brought me to be very vain and foolish, inticing me to spend (as she did) her time *in seeing and reading plays and romances,* and in exquisite and curious dressing.[15]

After a few years residence in court Thomas would not have been lacking in the exteriors of culture. He must

[15] *Percy Society Publications, op. cit.,* p. 4.

have learned French, although he seems to have been a poor linguist. We know this from the fact that he was still having difficulty in speaking Italian after he had spent nearly a year in Italy as a youth, after he had gone on an extensive mission into it for Prince Charles in 1647, and after he had dwelled there for nearly two years as royal ambassador after 1651.[16] He professed a great love for music all his life, but disclaimed all technical knowledge of the art. He could not have become an occasional or lyrical poet, for although he sometimes inserts songs in his plays, he is always unperturbed by the exigencies of meter. Probably he simply suffered from a hyperbolically bad ear. In his conversation he must have been very eloquent. That he had mastered the courtly tongue is evidenced by his epistolary style. Writing to Lord Feilding in 1636, he says:

> I will not be faltey of so much wanetey as to belief I chan desserfe such a sevilletey as your lettar brought . . . but though it be not in my powr to desserfe, yet grattitude is myne as freiley to bestoe as obligastianes yourres, and with that coyne, if it be currant in Vennis, I dare hope to pay sum of your sevilletes backe.[17]

If we disregard the quaintness of some of the spelling in this passage, and especially if we take the trouble to read the passage aloud, we detect in it the rhythm and the rhetorical elegance of the language of *The Arcadia*. A courtier who had mastered this style would not have missed very much a knowledge of Greek and the Phi-

[16] The missions into Italy will be described in detail below.

[17] *Historical MSS Commission*, MSS of the Earl of Denbigh, Part V (1911), p. 18.

losophies. In this connection it might be pointed out that the language of Killigrew's plays, which has constantly been described as super-inflated, seems not to have been so far removed from the language which courtiers actually employed upon formal or fashionable occasions. What may seem artificial to us would not have seemed nearly so artificial to the audience for which the plays were designed. The courtly argot and proficiency in the exercises of politeness were not the only things which a page in the court might have added to his accomplishments. "Educated at court" means many things. At the time of which we are writing it meant, above all, training in worldliness, and training in subservience. The processes of Killigrew's "higher" education will be implicit in some of our later paragraphs, but a recapitulation of one aspect of this education has been furnished by our dramatist himself. The following passage may begin in boastful vein, but it ends upon a very definite note of truth:

> Don Thomaso has seen the World, and Gather'd from every Nation what is excellent, and can comply with times and natures, for he has been bred in Courts and Armies, those schools of the mind, where men learn to tame their wills and passions; for Princes are to be studied and obey'd, not disputed with.[18]

The exact date when Thomas Killigrew left his family and his schooling and entered court service must remain conjectural. The existing brief notices of his life give the year of his appointment as a page in the court as 1633,[19] but this is incorrect since in July, 1632,

[18] *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* Part II, Act II, Scene 1, Folio, 1664, p. 402.

[19] *D. N. B.,* XXXI, 111; and J. L. Chester, *op. cit.,* p. 207.

he was not only mentioned in that capacity but seems to have been sufficiently well established to be receiving special favors from the King.[20] It is probable that his removal to court took place some years earlier even than this. Evidence points to the year 1625 when Thomas would have been approaching fourteen, an age at which many gentlemen's sons entered a university, and others were considered not too young to be launched upon their careers at court. In Restoration times Thomas himself entered a caveat dated November 24, 1671, that his son Robert be granted the first vacancy among the pages of honor to Charles II.[21] In 1671 Robert could not have been more than twelve years of age. Not only was Thomas of a logical age to enter court service in 1625, but we know that in this year Sir Robert had placed a son at court and that this son was meeting difficulties there. The politic father wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton offering to remove his son from the Prince's service because the latter had taken a dislike to the boy's "crooked legs."[22] The name of the

[20] *Rymer's Foedera,* London, 1732, XIX, 383. Thomas Killigrew is specified here as one of two pages, "our welbeloved Servants," who are to receive certain fines imposed upon Sir James Winkfeild and Sir Francis Boddenham.

[21] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1671, p. 583.

[22] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1623–25, p. 508. In 1625 Carleton had been appointed by Buckingham's influence vice-chamberlain of the household, and therefore enjoyed jurisdiction in matters of minor court offices. In 1619 Carleton had done some kindness for another of Sir Robert's sons (*Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1619–23, p. 20) whereupon the grateful father sent him a perspective glass and his lady a greyhound (*Ibid.,* p. 77). The son referred to must have been William, who was the oldest, although only thirteen at this time. The nature of Carleton's favor in this case is puzzling since he is supposed to have been upon one of his diplomatic missions to the Hague in 1619. Cf. *D. N. B.,* II, 87.

son is not given, and the reference may be to one of Thomas's brothers. But those brothers of about his own age were both sent to Oxford, and of the one other possibility, Charles (who would have been sixteen at this time), there is absolutely no mention after 1622. It appears probable that the letter alludes to Thomas. If such is the case, the meticulous Prince Charles must have overcome his repugnance to bowlegs after he became King, an event which occurred shortly after the date of this letter. There is no subsequent reference to this physical defect in our author, but such a disability in a boy of thirteen (particularly noticeable in a court page), time would tend to correct. Without insisting upon the year 1625 as the exact date, one may at least say that it was in boyhood that Thomas entered upon the difficult apprenticeship to the trade of the courtier. After 1633, references to him at court are fairly numerous, and it might be well to review his practical situation at this time.

In 1633 Thomas Killigrew was just entering upon his majority. In this year also his father died. It has been pointed out that as a Killigrew he could have enjoyed little family prestige, although his position as a gentleman was assured. He was many degrees removed socially from such common playwrights as Heywood and Dekker,[23] while even a gentleman dramatist such as Shirley would have been more than willing to

[23] As a concrete illustration of this fact, one may point to the extremely obsequious tone which the great poet Dekker felt called upon to assume when he addressed himself to Lodowick Carlell. Carlell like Killigrew was a courtier dramatist, but he was of humbler origin than Killigrew and was little higher in the scale of importance in the court. Cf. the Dedication of Dekker's *Match Mee in London,* 1631.

acknowledge his acquaintance. Financially he was not well off. Younger sons, unless their parents had been very wealthy indeed, rarely were. His father had left him 100 acres of reclaimed fen lands in Lincolnshire, and a part interest in a Cornish manor, heavily entailed and of questionable value.[24] The only time he received cash through family legacy was in 1622 when his grandmother had left him £5, the same amount which she willed to his cousin, William Berkeley, and to the poor of the parish of Lothbury.[25] His income from his position as Page of Honor was £100 a year.[26] These apparently were his entire resources—enough to maintain a man in these times, but far from enough to maintain a court gallant. It is not surprising that among the early references to Thomas Killigrew at court, most of them have to do with his strenuous attempts to bolster up his income.

At this time, and indeed long after, impecunious courtiers were in the habit of "begging estates." Such fines in cash or in confiscated properties as accrued to the crown from convicted malefactors were frequently distributed among courtier petitioners. The petitioner would often bear the expense of the arrest and the prosecution, merely hoping for a substantial return upon his personal investment. At other times the petitioner was only the court agent for alert harpies who made their living by preying upon their fellow citizens. The whole practice was a vicious one, con-

[24] P. C. C., 69 Russell.

[25] P. C. C., 71 Clarke.

[26] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1635, pp. 80, 444; *Ibid.,* 1635–36, p. 226.

verting young gentlemen into civil spies—sometimes in league with professional bearers of false witness. A succinct contemporary allusion to the practice occurs in Shakerley Marmion's *The Antiquary*. Mocinigo has been detected in a crime by Lorenzo, and Lorenzo's wife says:

> Away with him, husband: and be sure to beg his lands betimes, before your court-vultures scent his carcase.[27]

Killigrew became a "court-vulture." No stigma attached to the practice in his day, and he was simply following the lead of his fellow courtiers, many of whom had less reason to indulge in the practice than himself. Nevertheless this supplied a dangerous training for a young man, and may account for the fact that the worst thing that can be said of Thomas Killigrew is that he was addicted to sharp practice in money matters all his life. To be attached to the court and to retain one's absolute integrity called upon reserves of moral strength not possessed by the average man; Killigrew was simply no better and no worse than the average man. In September of this very year, 1633, he and David Ramsey, "the King's servants," desired to benefit from the conviction of Francis Smith, "a Jesuit dangerous for transporting young people." Annexed to their petition is the "presumed" minute of the King's compliance.[28] Three years later Killigrew and another courtier were granted the real and personal property of Francis Lockwood "by reason he died a Romish

[27] Act V, Scene 1; *Dodsley's Select Collection of Old English Plays*, W. C. Hazlitt, Ed., London, 1875, XIII, 510.

[28] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, 1633–34, p. 223.

priest."[29] In July, 1638, Thomas begged the property of Simon Jackson of Botsone (Bottisham ?) lately convicted of manslaughter.[30] It is unnecessary to multiply instances of this activity. The case of the Jesuit, Francis Smith, is particularly unpleasant to review because the victim was a man eighty years of age. In June, 1638, having been released from prison through the intercession of Queen Henrietta Maria, he was forced to beg the King's protection against further molestation. Happily, in this second persecution our dramatist seems to have played no part.[31] It is interesting to observe that Killigrew's petitions were usually granted by the King, and that this is not the only evidence of his favor with the first Charles.[32] One may wonder how the Catholic Queen would respond to this practice of preying upon members of her faith, especially by one who, we shall see, was in her courtly literary circle. The fact is that if she knew of Killigrew's part in these activities she was not yet in a position to resent it. At his time persecution of the poorer Catholics was still the normal thing. We shall see that whatever Killigrew may have done in this respect, it did

[29] *Ibid.*, 1637–38, p. 147.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 552.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 511–12.

[32] In 1636 Edward Rawley, a servant of Thomas Killigrew, struck a harbinger at Newmarket and was imprisoned. Killigrew furnished bail for the prisoner, and in return for this kindness Rawley robbed his master and fled the land. The King on this occasion consented to remit the bail. Cf. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, 1637–38, p. 9. On another occasion in 1638 the King consented to attend in person a hearing in which Killigrew was concluding a suit against certain intruders upon his Majesty's coal mines in Northumberland. Cf. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, 1637–38, pp. 247, 419, 517.

not disrupt his friendly relations with the Honorable Walter Montague, an ardent convert to Catholicism.

Killigrew's connection with the romance-reading, play-loving Queen, and the circle of literary courtiers of her time is more interesting to us than his financial expedients. That this circle did exist in the court of Charles I need not be argued. There can be little doubt either that Henrietta Maria, after her French attendants had been packed off, and after she had become accustomed to the English tongue and her English court, formed one nucleus of this circle. The Queen loved plays. The fact that she became the patron of a company of players may not be significant, but it is certainly significant that she did the rather audacious thing of attending the semi-public theatre. One evening in a later reign Killigrew was contrasting for Pepys the theatre of the Restoration with the theatre of his youth, and among the many improvements which he claimed to have brought about was, that while in 1667 royalty commonly attended the theatre, in former days "the Queene seldom and the King never would come."[33] In other words the Queen did come at times. We know this from more direct information. About 1636 Charles, Prince Palatine, wrote to the Queen of Bohemia, and told among other things that

> The King sate yesterday at Van Dyke's for the Prince of Orange, but your Majesty hath forgate to send me the mesure of the picture; his howse is close by Blake Friers, where the Quene saw Lodwick Carlile's second part of Arviragus and Felicia acted, which is hugely liked of every one, he will not fail to send it to your Majesty.[34]

[33] *Pepys' Diary,* February 12, 1666/67.

[34] *Historical MSS Commission,* Third Report (1872), p. 118.

Arviragus and Philicia, Carlell's long, dramatized romance is probably a fair example of what the Queen liked to see when she went to the theatre. The author was a minor courtier and he may have written this play with the Queen's approval in view.[35] A number of similar courtier productions must have been designed primarily to give the Queen the same pleasure in the playhouse that she derived from reading her favorite French romances. Thomas Killigrew was not behindhand in entering the lists to please the Queen, and some time between 1633 and 1635 his first play, *The Prisoners,* an ultra-romantic tragi-comedy, was written.[36]

While it is not a part of our task to complete the picture of the group of play-writing courtiers, and of the Queen's part in stimulating it, it is necessary to establish the fact that Killigrew was of the circle. The fact is fairly apparent. We have seen that his father had been, and two of his sisters still were, personal attendants upon Her Majesty. It may be less significant that his cousin, Henry Jermyn, was soon to become her especial favorite. It is certainly significant that his future wife, whom Thomas began to court about 1633, was maid of honor to Henrietta Maria, and the marriage of our dramatist was finally celebrated at Her Majesty's house at Oatlands. We must remember that by ap-

[35] In 1664 Carlell wrote his last play, *Heraclius,* and stated expressly that the work had taken birth at her Majesty's house and was undertaken because Henrietta Maria loved plays of this kind. Cf. C. H. Gray, *Lodowick Carliell,* Chicago, 1905, p. 41. It may be remembered that when this play was written William Killigrew had also taken to writing plays of the kind that the Queen loved. Cf. Chapter I, p. 32.

[36] The date of composition will be considered in the general discussion of the play below.

pointment Killigrew was the King's servant and not the Queen's, so it is natural that surviving official documents should connect his name with that of Charles rather than with that of Henrietta Maria. Nevertheless documentary evidence of relations between the Queen and the playwright is not altogether lacking. We shall see that in the troublesome times to come, Killigrew became one of the Queen's messengers to her beleaguered husband. The Queen's interest in drama had, of course, its chief manifestation in the court itself, at Whitehall and at Oatlands. Some of the plays which finally reached the public stage enjoyed their first showing as courtly entertainments.[37] Amateur acting was beginning to be the rage among circles of gentlefolk other than those at the universities and in the Inns of Court. The masque of course was still firmly intrenched in the court, and there is evidence which connects Killigrew with this form of dramatic activity. He could not have written masques because he had no skill as a versifier, but he told Pepys in later times that he had been active in attempting to improve the court music at this period.[38] More concrete evidence of Killigrew's connection with the production of court masques is furnished by a note which he has left to explain the song appended to his play *Cicilia and Clorinda:*

This Chorus was written by M. Thomas Carew, Cup-bearer to Charles the First; and sung in a Masque at White-hall, Anno

[37] Carlell in his dedication of *The Deserving Favorite* states specifically that originally the play "was not designed to travell so farre as the common stage." Cf. edition by C. H. Gray, Chicago, 1905, p. 35.

[38] *Pepys' Diary,* February 12, 1666/67.

1633. And I presume to make use of it here, because in the first design, 'twas writ at my request upon a dispute held betwixt Mistress Cicilia Crofts and my self, where he was present; she being then Maid of Honour: this I have set down, lest any man should believe me so foolish as to steal such a Poem from so famous an Author; or so vain as to pretend the making of it my self; and those that are not satisfied with this Apology, and this Song in this place; I am always ready to give them a worse of mine own.[39]

The song was probably designed for some impromptu entertainment which Killigrew may have been instrumental in organizing. He may have played a part in this and in other court performances.[40] In this connection an episode must be mentioned which is of lasting interest to students of English dramatic history. In 1632 the Queen herself had taken part with her court ladies in the pastoral *The Shepherds' Paradise,* an event

[39] *Cicilia and Clorinda,* Part II, Act V, Scene 2, Folio, 1664, p. 309. The song is in two parts, and is on the theme of jealousy. It is printed in Carew's works among "Four Songs, by way of Chorus to a Play, at an entertainment of the King and Queen by My Lord Chamberlain." Two additional songs for the same play are also printed. Cf. edition of A. Vincent, London, 1899, pp. 83-89. Fleay considered the songs designed for Shirley's *Arcadia* (*A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559–1642,* 2 vols., London, 1891, II, 24), but they would not have been especially appropriate in that play. If one ignores the title of one of the songs, "A Lover, in the Disguise of an Amazon, is dearly Beloved of his Mistress," he finds that any one of the six could have been sung appropriately at some point in Killigrew's early play, *The Prisoners.* However it is improbable that the songs were designed for this play or for any other production that has come down to us.

[40] J. Knight in his notice of Killigrew in *D. N. B.* mentions an engraving supposed to have been done for a masque, in which Thomas Killigrew and Lord Coleraine are depicted as "The Princely Shepherds." I have been unable to trace this engraving, but I see no reason to doubt that it exists. Hugh Hare, 1st Lord Coleraine, was just the kind of person with whom we should expect Killigrew to have been associated. He seems to have been the incarnation of the pseudo-romantic ideal. Cf. *D. N. B.,* XXIV, 368.

which so coincided with Prynne's untimely aspersions upon "women actors" that the redoubtable author of *Histriomastix* went to the pillory. The Honorable Walter Montague,[41] author of the pastoral, spent most of the time immediately following his single dramatic venture in France, where he was converted to the Catholic faith. He returned to England in July, 1635, and whereas he had been a favorite with Henrietta Maria before, he was doubly so now. At this time, or probably earlier, at the time when *The Shepherds' Paradise* was being rehearsed, Killigrew attracted Montague's attention. If we had no other evidence of Killigrew's connection with the Queen's circle, his association with Walter Montague would almost suffice to prove our point. Three months after his return to England in 1635, Montague resumed his travels, and this time Thomas Killigrew went with him.

Killigrew's first trip abroad has been spoken of as a "grand tour," but investigation puts a somewhat different complexion upon it. Montague was about nine years older than Killigrew, and was the son of an earl. Killigrew was evidently traveling as gentleman attendant upon Montague, and the latter was traveling not for pleasure but to become, at Rome, a father of the Oratory. In fact this was only one of several projects, all very serious in nature. Since the point has never

[41] Walter Montague, secret diplomatist, royalist, and later a powerful Catholic prelate in France, was a very important personage. He is said to have enjoyed the confidence of three queens, the Queen-mother of France, Mary de Medici, and Henrietta Maria. Cf. *D. N. B.*, XXXVIII, 370. His translation from the French, *The Accomplished Woman*, 8°, 1656, is mentioned by Killigrew many years before the date of its publication. Cf. *The Parson's Wedding*, Act II, Scene 2, Folio, 1664, p. 89.

been made that Montague was accompanied by Killigrew on this journey, it might be well to establish this fact first. On October 30, 1635, Sir John Pennington reported to the Lords of the Admiralty that on the 15th the *Vanguard* had taken "Mr. Montagu, Sir William St. Ravy and Mr. Killigrew" aboard and had landed them at Calais, returning to the *Swiftsure* in the Downes early upon the 18th.[42] The trip had been made apparently for the sole purpose of conveying the three gentlemen[43] across the channel. That the "Mr. Montagu" referred to in Pennington's report is Walter and that the "Mr. Killigrew" is Thomas, is established by letters written by the latter during the course of the journey. Only a few of these letters[44] survive, but since the writer usually tells where he is going and where he has been, it is possible to reconstruct the itinerary of his travels. Only about two months were spent in France. From Calais the travelers had gone for a brief stay in Paris. They then proceeded to Tours and Orleans, making a short excursion to Loudun to visit the convent of the "possessed" Ursuline nuns. The demonstrations of these nuns, from whom devils were exorcised for the delectation of visitors, were

[42] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1635, p. 438.

[43] Sir William St. Ravy was another courtier of the times; three years after this date he was sent by Charles to congratulate the King and Queen of France upon the birth of their son, and on this mission he was accompanied by Henry Jermyn who was to convey similar felicitations from Henrietta Maria. Cf. *Historical MSS Commission,* MSS of the Earl of Denbigh, Part V (1911), p. 61.

[44] *Ibid.,* p. 18. One epistle sent home by Killigrew is in the nature of a "news-letter," and the location of the several extant copies of it will be noted below. There is, I believe, only one such letter and not a series of them as the *D. N. B.* suggests.

subsequently proven a religious hoax, but the display was convincing enough to have aided the year before in effecting Montague's conversion. From Orleans the travelers continued southward, probably passing through Basle in Switzerland, and arriving at Vercelli, Italy, some days before January 17, 1636. They then continued south to Rome, and here and in Naples Killigrew spent most of the remaining winter. On his return northward it is probable that he kept a promise to Lord Feilding by waiting upon that official at Venice. By June, 1636, after an absence of about seven months, he was back in England, for his marriage took place on the 26th of this month.

The letter which Killigrew wrote describing his experiences at the convent of the Ursuline nuns was so interesting that it was widely distributed in manuscript and as a printed news-letter.[45] It reveals the personality of the writer in a very attractive light. Killigrew was no cynical or skeptical observer; he was open-minded, but at the same time open-eyed. One of the nuns while possessed was supposed to undergo a miraculous physical transformation, and visitors were permitted to feel her stony limbs. Like a docile tourist, Killigrew did what he was expected to do, but in describing the experience he said:

[45] The letter was originally addressed, it would seem, to Lord Goring, and was dated Orleans, Dec. 7, 1635. Copies of it are preserved among *Additional MSS in the British Museum,* 27402, f. 70; *Ashmolean MSS,* 800, 3, ff. 21–27 (Bod: Lib.); *Pepys MSS,* 8383 (Magdalene Coll., Camb.); *MSS of Trinity College, Dublin,* 1655. It has been reprinted in the *European Magazine,* 1803, pp. 102–106. Further information concerning its subject matter may be found in *Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France,* S. II, V, 183–223.

I must tell you the truth, I only felt firm flesh, strong arms, and legs held out stiff. But others affirm, that felt it, that she was all stiff and heavy as iron; but they had more faith than I, and it seemed the miracle appeared more visible to them than to me.[46]

Other nuns writhed about the floor in their agonies, and this was even less convincing to the spectator. He comments that

. . . in all his actions [that is, the actions of the devil in the nun] I saw little above nature or a tumbler's expression.

Nevertheless one miracle was so skilfully managed that he forsook his doubts long enough to join other visitors in signing an affidavit concerning its authenticity. As interesting to us as our dramatist's acuteness as an observer, and his honesty and skill in description, is the sympathy which he displays in this letter, and the language in which this sympathy is expressed. Of one nun he says:

She was very young and handsome, of a more tender look and slender shape than any of the rest; her arms and hands so small and white, as she shewed a breeding not answerable to the estate she was in. You would have thought her servant could only have led her by that hand, and not have hurt her. The loveliness of her face was cloathed in a sad sable look, which upon my coming into the chapel she hid, but presently unveiled again: and, though she stood now bound like a slave in the friar's hand, you might see through all her misfortunes, in her black eyes, the unruined arches of many triumphs. . . .

In casting out the devil from this particular victim, the friar found it necessary to stand upon her bosom, and Killigrew remarks,

[46] The version printed in the *European Magazine* is followed here and in subsequent quotations.

I confess it was so sad a sight, I had no power to see the miracle wrought of her recovery, but went from thence to the Inn. . . .

There is something in the tone of this that argues in our author, up to this time at least, an uncorrupted mind.

It is impossible to say whether or not Killigrew was always in the company of Montague while in Italy. That he was at Montague's service is illustrated by a passage in his letter to Lord Feilding:

I am so faltey to you as to breake my prommis which was to waet upon you befoer my jurney to Rome, which ressolussion Mr. Mountecu has changed and commanded me to waet apon him to Rome. . . .[47]

Montague's actions in Italy were closely observed by all the resident English officials. It is probable that their suspicions were justified when they wrote of his "strong practices with the French," and surmised that the real object of his visit was to serve France by making overtures of peace to the Emperor and to the King of Spain; in which case, wrote Lord Feilding, "I must confess his change in religion the more excusable if done because he might bee rendered a more fitt instrument for such a reconciliation."[48] It is fairly certain that if Montague held any English commission, it was from the Queen and not from the King. He was entertained like an ambassador at Rome and in Savoy, and Killigrew may have enjoyed some reflected prestige without being over-conscious of any deep diplomatic

[47] *Historical MSS Commission,* MSS of Earl of Denbigh, Part V (1911), p. 18.

[48] *Ibid.,* pp. 12, 16, 17, 19, 25, *et passim.*

forces at work. He was probably engrossed in the new sensations of foreign travel. This trip to Italy bore very directly upon his dramatic career. Two new tragi-comedies, *Claricilla,* and *The Princess,*[49] were actually written, at least in part, during this sojourn from England. Italy seems always to have been the land of enchantment to him. All of his plays except the two comedies deal with conflicts and reconciliations among the various Italian states. Owing to the extremely romantic nature of the plays, one hesitates to say that materials may have been suggested to their author by actual experiences in Italy; still we must remember that Italy was a more romantic place in 1636 than it is today, and travelers looked about them with more romantic eyes. During this very visit, Walter Montague conceived the chivalric notion of taking the field with the army of the Duke of Savoy.[50] Sir Alexander Gordon was in Italy at this time and was writing to his friends about adventures not unlike incidents which actually form a part of one of Killigrew's plays.[51] As a rule we are so intent upon finding literary sources for plays that we fail to consider their possible biographical content. By May 11, 1636, Montague had

[49] For the date of these plays, see below.

[50] *Historical MSS Commission,* MSS of Earl of Denbigh, Part V (1911), p. 17.

[51] Reference to one of these adventures occurs below in the discussion of the source of *Thomaso or the Wanderer.* Killigrew knew Gordon, and in the postscript of his letter to Lord Feilding he said, "Pray tell Gurddine I am his servant, and wil not faell to waet upon him to Jerussalim if he wille stay." This was not simply rhetorical, because Gordon was actually contemplating a journey to the Holy Land. Cf. *Historical MSS Commission,* MSS of Earl of Denbigh, Part V, p. 12. Who can say what might have been the result if these two had made this pilgrimage together!

returned from Rome to Vercelli with one "Mr. Magdevall." The latter may have been Killigrew, for like the heroes of their romances, young gentlemen of this time were fond of traveling incognito for no reason whatever. Killigrew was certainly on his way northward by May, and at this time or perhaps earlier, he must have parted company with Montague, because the latter remained in Savoy until the following November.[52]

Killigrew's return to England was celebrated by his marriage to his first and, if the expression be not amiss, his favorite wife. He had known the lady at least since 1633. A brief history of his marriage is supplied by entries which he made some time later in his family Bible:

I was maried to my First wife Ms Cissillia Croftes of Saxsame in Suffoke at Otlands apone Sent Peiteres day being the 29 of Juene 1636. Tho Killigrew

My suenne Harrey Killigrew was borrn apoen Esterday following being the 9 of Aprill and Sunday 1637. Tho. Killigrew

My wife diede apoen Nue Yeares day after being the 1 of Januarey and apone a Monday $16\frac{37}{38}$ nue stiell in London and lies berried in Westminster Abbey. Tho. Killigrew [53]

Cecilia Crofts was of good family. She was the daughter of Sir John Crofts and his wife Mary, daughter of Sir Thomas Shirley.[54] Sir John had enjoyed the friendship of King James, and Cecilia's experiences in court had begun early. In February, 1620, Carleton had received a letter telling him:

[52] *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 40.
[53] The Killigrew Bible, cf. note 1, above.
[54] J. L. Chester, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

The King is still at Newmarket. He is to go next week a-shroving to Sir John Crofts. That Lady and her daughter Cecily have been much at Newmarket of late.[55]

Thomas Carew celebrated the nuptials of Thomas and Cecilia, these servants respectively of the King and Queen, in his poem *On the Marriage of T K and C C: the Morning Stormy*—

> Such should this day be, so the sun should hide
> His bashful face, and let the conquering bride
> Without a rival shine, whilst he forbears
> To mingle his unequal beams with hers;
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The cheerful bridegroom to the clouds and wind
> Hath all his tears and all his sighs assigned;
> Let tempests struggle in the air, but rest
> Eternal calms within thy peaceful breast
> Thrice happy youth! but ever sacrifice
> To that fair hand that dried thy blubber'd eyes—[56]
>
> . . . . . .

The attainment of that which Carew goes on to say the bridegroom had "toiled for with a long pursuit" must have been made the occasion of quite a fashionable ceremony at the Queen's house. The marriages of maids of honor were not suffered to pass without royal condescensions, and the bride's relatives in this case were many and of some social eminence. One of her sisters was the wife of Thomas Wentworth, first Earl of Cleve-

[55] Arthur Vincent, *The Poems of Thomas Carew*, London, 1899, p. 242.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 111. It has been suggested by Arthur Vincent as possible, although unlikely, that Cecilia may have been the fickle *Celia* of Carew's poems. It is quite unlikely since the poet was considerably older than she, having actually been a friend of her father: see the poems in evidence of that friendship, pp. 36, 40, in Vincent's edition.

land; and others among her numerous brothers and sisters were founding peerages.[57]

It might be well to pause for a moment to consider the situation of the bridegroom at the time of his marriage and during the period immediately following. We have had two evidences already of his friendship with Thomas Carew, the chief lyricist immediately connected with the court. Further evidence of this friendship is furnished by a picture which has come down to us wherein these two courtiers are portrayed together.[58] When we consider the range of Carew's literary acquaintance, we recognize the probability that his young friend had contacts with Townshend, Carey, Sandys, Selden, Digby, Cotton, Vaughan, Davenant and others. His position in the court is almost sufficient to predicate intimate relationships both with poets who had been writing back in the reign of James and with those who were just beginning to write late in the reign of Charles. All these poets knew each other fairly well. Carew himself was a close friend of Montague and wrote several very fervid poems to celebrate that friendship.[59] Carlell dedicated a play to Will Murray, and Will Murray, as we shall see, was an associate of Killigrew.[60] To advance somewhat in point of time, Killigrew dedicated one of his plays to his wife's niece, Lady Ann Wentworth,[61] and to this same lady Richard Lovelace dedicated his *Lucasta*. Killigrew not only knew the

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 241.

[58] The painting hangs in the Van Dyke room at Windsor Castle.

[59] *The Poems of Thomas Carew, op. cit.*, pp. 108, 169.

[60] *The Deserving Favourite* was dedicated to Thomas Carey and Will Murray. Cf. edition of C. H. Gray, Chicago, 1905, p. 33.

[61] *The Princesse* was so dedicated. Cf. Folio, 1664.

courtly poets of his day, but was recognized as one of them. Shortly after his return from Italy, one of his new plays was brought out at the Phoenix by Her Majesty's Players.[62] His dramatic pieces up to this time were no more than amateur experiments, but they were so nicely keyed to the tone of the times that they must have been quite successful. That well-known catalogue of poets furnished about 1637 by John Suckling's *A Session of the Poets* omits Killigrew's name although it includes those of such contemporaries as May, Berkeley, and Chillingworth. But this deficiency is supplied by another poem written about the same time by Lord Falkland. Among the verses which the latter contributed to *Jonsonus Virbius* occur the following:

> Let Digby, Carew, Killigrew and Maine,
> Godolphin, Waller, that inspired train—
> Or whose rare pen beside deserves the grace
> Or of an equal, or a neighbouring place—
> Answer thy wish, for none so fit appears
> To raise his Tomb, as who are left his heirs.[63]

On the basis of these lines it is tempting to number Killigrew among the "Sons of Ben," but the truth is that there is little either in his life or his works to justify an assumption that he had come under the aegis of the great rival of Shakespeare. Killigrew belonged to a somewhat different circle. Falkland's lines simply demonstrate the fact that Killigrew was accepted by the poets as one of their number.

In 1637 then, at twenty-five years of age, Thomas

[62] Cf. the title page to *The Prisoners* and *Claracilla*, 12°, 1641.

[63] *Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies Library*, A. B. Grosart, Ed., 3 vols., 1871, Vol. III.

Killigrew was fashionably married, was in favor with the King and Queen, and was recognized as a literary man. We know from later evidence that he loved fine dress and liveried servants, so he probably cut a dashing figure. No breath of scandal seems to have attached to his name up to this time. Beginning his career at court with little money and little education, he had won a place for himself by energy, talent, and personal charm. His charm must have been considerable since he was able to ingratiate himself with two such persons as Thomas Carew and Walter Montague. There is nothing to show that his marriage was anything but happy. It must be more than a coincidence that several of his most spotless heroines bear the name Cecilia. Unfortunately the affection for his first wife seems to have extended over into the period of his second marriage. On the first day of 1638 Cecilia died, and whereas her epithalamion had been written by Thomas Carew, her elegy was written by Francis Quarles.[64] In his Epistle to Lady Crofts, Cecilia's mother, Quarles says,

Not many Ladies in this Land could shew a fairer Inventory of God's favour than your selfe; either as single in youre owne person, or as multiplied, in your children. . . .

[64] *Sighes at the contemporary deaths of Those incomparable Sisters The Countesse of Cleaveland and Mistrisse Cicly Killegve.* . . . Breathed forth by F. Q., 12°, London, 1640. Cf. *Chertsey Worthies Library,* "The Complete Works of Francis Quarles," A. B. Grosart, Ed., Edinburgh, 1881, III, 36. Carew had died at some time during the brief period of Killigrew's marriage, so that no poem of his celebrates the occasion of the latter's bereavement. One other poem is connected with the name of Killigrew's wife. Among the *Sir T. Phillips MSS,* 4001, were anonymous verses, *Epithalamia on the marriage of Lady Kath. Egerton to Mr. Wm. Custeen and Mrs. Cecelia Crofts to Mr. Thos. Killegrew.*

We know little of Cecilia except what we can learn from eulogistic verse, but even after the claims of some of this are cautiously discounted, the impression remains that she was a handsome and estimable young woman. Her son Harry proved in all ways unworthy of her.

It may be that Thomas Killigrew began to go the pace after his wife died. This would not be an isolated phenomenon among young widowers: the single child of Thomas and Cecilia was described in 1677 as

> . . . a widdower these two dayes and laments his condition that fortune has made it possible for him to play the fool again, considering what use hee is wont to make of the power of committing errours, besides human frailty in general.[65]

There is no real evidence that Thomas set up as a rake after 1638, although a certain coarsening of his nature seems to have taken place. About 1641 he wrote his comedy, *The Parson's Wedding*, and the vulgarity of much of this piece is in startling contrast to the superlatively elevated tone of the three preceding plays. Before we range the sentiments expressed in this play as so much evidence against Killigrew's character, it is necessary to take certain phenomena into consideration. Nearly all the gentlemen poets of this time had their extremely seamy side, a fact not commonly recognized by those who come in contact with their verse only after it has passed through the purifying filter of the anthologist. One who has read *Cooper's Hill* would never suspect that John Denham could write such verse as his *Dialogue between Sir John Pooley and Mr. Thomas*

[65] *Historical MSS Commission*, MSS of the Marquess of Bath at Longleat, Vol. II (1907), p. 158. The extract is from a letter sent by Henry Savile to the Earl of Rochester.

Killigrew.[66] These stanzas are directed against Pooley rather than Killigrew, but the point is that they are more scandalous than anything the latter ever wrote. Killigrew has been unfortunate in this respect: whereas only the elevated poetry of his contemporaries has been widely read, his single piece reprinted for circulation among posterity has been *The Parson's Wedding*. It is probable that in this play we have no real reflection of Killigrew's habits and opinions, but only a species of "counter-pose." There seems to have come among the polished, idle, and aimless young gentlemen of these times a rather ugly species of backwash, resulting no doubt from the cramped posturing of the court, with its artificial gallantries and incessant patter about platonic love. It is unlikely that either Killigrew or his group lived eminently virtuous lives. Thomas Carew himself was not the most exemplary type of mentor one might have selected for a young man. On the other hand the tendency is to exaggerate the evil and the interesting. It is probable that these young men, who became the cavaliers, were not so bad as they (by their own connivance) have been painted. And Killigrew was not distinguished either by his virtue or his vice from the others.

The Parson's Wedding was designed for a popular audience and not to please the Queen. At this time our dramatist was evidently considering play-writing as a means of supplementing his income. By 1641 two of his older plays had been turned over to the book-

[66] *The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham*, T. H. Banks, Jr., Ed., New Haven, 1928, p. 103.

sellers for what they would bring. Even as late as 1641 writing for the popular theatre seems to have been a radical gesture for anyone socially connected with the court. In this very comedy there is a revealing dialogue bearing upon this subject. In Act III, Scene 2, one of the gallants has proposed a visit to the theatre—

Jolly. On my word this is held the best penn'd of the time and he has writ a very good Play; By this Day, it was extreamly applauded.

Captain. Do's he write Plays by the Day; Indeed a man would ha judged him a labouring Poet.

Jolly. A Labouring Poet? by this hand hee's a Knight; upon my recommendation venture to see it; hang me if you be not extreamly well satisfied.

Careless, A Knight and write Playes? it may be, but 'tis strange to us; so they say there are other Gentlemen Poets without Land or Latine; this was not ordinary; prithee when was he knighted?

Jolly. In the North, the last great knighting, when 'twas Gods great Mercy we were not all Knights.

Wild. I'll swear, they say, there are Poets that have more Men in Liveries, then Books in their studies.

Captain. And what think you, Gentlemen, are not these things to start a Man? I believe 'tis the first time you found them lie at the sign of the Page, Foot-men and gilded Coaches; They were wont to lodge at the thin Cloak, they and their Muses made up the family; And thence sent Scenes to their Patrons, like Boyes in at windows, and one would return with a Dublett, another with a pair of Breeches, a third with a little ready Money; which, together with their credit with a company, in three Tearms you rarely saw a Poet repaired.

Jolly. This truth no body denies.

Wild. Prithee let us resolve what we shall do, lest we meet with

> some of them: for it seemes they swarm, and I fear nothing like a Dedication. . . .[67]

It is pretty certain that any play written by a courtier would be widely, and not too kindly, discussed. To write a play like *The Parson's Wedding* was decidedly indiscreet. This comedy may have been the sole provocation for a virulent attack launched upon the author about 1642. A caricature of Killigrew by Hollar was circulated; under the picture there were satirical verses accusing the courtier of having ruined his health and dissipated his fortunes through "Letcherie."[68] But these accusations would hardly stand in court. Killigrew lived to be over seventy, so he could hardly have been completely broken down at twenty-nine. The lines,

> Foole that I was, who had so faire a State
> Fower or five thousant by the yeare at least;

are untrue upon their face, for Killigrew never had a fifth of this income. His own resources have been reviewed, and his marriage could not have mended matters, for Cecilia was no heiress, being the tenth child in a family of eleven.[69] In Killigrew's day, one did not

[67] Cf. pp. 110–111, Folio, 1664. The passage evidently relates to some definite play, and since William Berkeley was knighted at Berwick in 1639 (W. A. Shaw, *The Knights of England,* London, 1906, II, 207), a pre-Restoration showing of his *Cornelia* suggests itself as a plausible guess as to the identity. Killigrew may have felt some natural pique when his cousin was knighted.

[68] Wen. Hollar's interesting engraving is in the British Museum. The sheet itself contains neither title, signature, nor date, but that it is Hollar's work is generally accepted, and that Killigrew is represented is apparent because of other pictures of the dramatist which have come down to us. The date of the original engraving will be discussed below. Cf. Chap. IV, note 57.

[69] A. Vincent, *The Poems of Thomas Carew,* London, 1899, p. 241.

have to wander far astray before he was rebuked by the satirist.

Probably Killigrew's chief crimes in the years preceding the Civil Wars were indiscreet writing and talking, and—impecuniosity. As early as 1637 his creditors were anticipating his visits to the Exchequer on the days when his annuity was due. Apparently his yearly stipend had been increased to £150 when he married, and in December, 1637, no less a person than the Earl of Dorset was paid the entire sum under Killigrew's assignment.[70] The dramatist was living too expensively. Up until 1637 Whitehall may be considered his home in London, but from 1637 until his final departure from the city in 1643 he had lodgings in the northwest angle of the Piazza.[71] The Piazza was an arcade in Covent Garden built by Inigo Jones about 1633/34, and it is reputed to have been a very fashionable residence. One did not live at the Piazza and cut a figure in the town for nothing. When Killigrew was arrested for his Royalist activities at the beginning of the Civil Wars, Parliament found it necessary to protect the prisoner against his anxious creditors.

In 1643 Killigrew's financial affairs must have been hopelessly involved. In the folio of his plays, published after the Restoration, he inserted a foreword mentioning with a sigh his "Twenty Years Banishment," but the truth of the matter is that the war and

[70] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, 1637–38, p. 112.

[71] The fact of Killigrew's residence in the Piazza is established by the rate books of St. Martin's and St. Paul's, Covent Garden. Cf. H. B. Wheatley & P. Cunningham, *London Past and Present*, 3 vols., London, 1891, III, 84.

the exile were the saving of him. His case was exactly that of John Denham and certain others of the cavaliers, with whom he was to associate in the years to follow. Had he not been driven into exile by Parliament, he would very probably have been driven into exile by his creditors. The wars made his banishment more romantic, and better provided with company. On the continent there was greater equality of poverty, for even the royal family was in straitened circumstances; no stigma attached to living by one's wits. If this review of Killigrew's youth has been successful, it will be apparent that the playwright was not altogether to blame for his situation in 1643. He had neither training nor education to be anything but a courtier, and his resources were not sufficient for him to sustain the rôle. Money had become too scarce in the Stuart court for him to have benefited much from royal or noble patronage. If it shall prove that the exile displayed disconcerting dexterity in living by his wits, we may again attend to what "Thomas" has said of "Thomaso":

> . . . thrown from his Cradle into other mens grounds, naked and unthought of by his Parents and Friends, and what was cruelty then, is his happiness now; for being bred with the wolf he grew wise enough to thrive in the forest.[72]

[72] *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* Part I, Act I, Scene 2, Folio, 1664, p. 321.

III

A PLAYWRIGHT IN EXILE

AT the outbreak of the Civil Wars, the Killigrews rallied around the standard of the King. There may have been a few exceptions to this rule, but not among members of the younger branches of the family.[1] The Earl of Clarendon has left us the description of a typical Killigrew action. Sir Henry (a second cousin of Thomas) was sitting in the House of Commons when Parliament was raising an army against the King. Various members were taking the floor to announce what forces they would raise and maintain. Sir Henry Killigrew could stand it no longer, and, rising to his feet, he said,

> He would provide a good horse, and a good buff coat, and a good pair of pistols, and then he doubted not he should find a good cause.[2]

In the stand taken by Thomas Killigrew himself, there was nothing of ambiguity; for him there was "no Rogue

[1] The descendants of Sir Henry and Sir William were all ardent Royalists, but one member at least of the older branch of the family succeeded in carrying water upon both shoulders. Sir Peter Killigrew, of the same generation in the older branch as Thomas in the younger, "in essentials preserving his loyalty to his prince [was] at the same time well with the great men of the opposite faction." ("The Family of Killigrew:" See above, Chap. I, note 1.) He was known as "Sir Peter the Post" from his activity in carrying messages between King Charles and Parliament. He was paid by Parliament. [*Commons Journals*, III, 95, Mar. 31, 1645.]

[2] Edward, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, 7 vols., Oxford, 1849, IV, 236.

like your Roundhead, a dissembling, insolent, bloody, blasphemous traytor."[3] Evidence is lacking that Thomas engaged like his eldest brother in actual military encounters, and the chances are that he did not; but he was active in the work of organization in the Royalist faction at the time when armed hostilities were impending. In November, 1641, he posted with a message from Queen Henrietta Maria to King Charles,[4] and, in the same month, the King sent him down from Scotland to Westminster with dispatches for Secretary Nicholas.[5] For several months he continued active as a Royalist courier or liaison officer.[6] His fellows in this work were such young men as Arthur Berkeley, Will Murray and Edward Progers, usually members of the King's personal household, and individuals in whom absolute trust could be reposed. Judging from the speed with which they covered distance, these couriers were earnest in their cause, and merciless upon their beasts.

Killigrew's active service was not of long duration. On February 26, 1642, it was moved in the Commons "That Mr. Tho. Killigrew be forwith summoned to attend this house."[7] Some months elapsed before hands could be laid upon the elusive cavalier, but by September he was committed to the custody of the marshal, Sir John Lenthall, "on suspicion for raising arms against

[3] *Thomaso or The Wanderer,* Part I, Act II, Scene 1, Folio, 1664, p. 328.

[4] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1641–43, p. 154.

[5] *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn, F. R. S.,* to which is subjoined The Private Correspondence between Charles I and Sir Edward Nicholas, etc., W. Bray, Ed., 4 vols., London, 1870, IV, 96.

[6] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1641–43, pp. 251–2.

[7] *Commons Journals,* II, 457.

Parliament."[8] During the following year Killigrew was effectively removed from the sphere of Royalist operations. Since he retained his lodgings at the Piazza, it is probable that he was paroled in London and was not actually incarcerated. However, his life could not have been a happy one in the Parliamentary center: the theatre was no more, and his creditors had not forgotten him. On May 16, 1643, he petitioned Parliament for protection against the several actions for debt being prosecuted against him, and the House of Lords obliged him by making void all such suits while he remained a prisoner.[9] By this time Killigrew had been remembered by his friends in the other camp. On July 27, 1643, it was ordered in the House of Lords, since "Mr. Killigrew is exchanged for another Prisoner at Oxon. and hath a Discharge from the Lord General," that he be given a pass to proceed to the Royalist army.[10] This is the last that we hear of Thomas Killigrew in England until the year of the Restoration.

Between the time when Killigrew left London and the time when we begin to hear of him as an exile on the continent, there is a lapse of several years. In the whole of the dramatist's later life, this constitutes the only period in which the researches of the biographer prove fruitless. It is possible, however, to fill the gap by means of a rather tenable theory. At the Restoration, Killigrew spoke of "Twenty Years Banish-

[8] *Historical MSS Commission,* Fifth Report, Appendix, Part I (1876), 63, 86; *Lords Journals,* V, 511; VI, 47.

[9] *Historical MSS Commission,* Sixth Report, Appendix, Part I, p. 115; *Lords Journals,* VI, 47.

[10] *Lords Journals,* VI, 151.

ment"; [11] he did this with no intention to deceive, for his readers must have known quite well how long he had been from England, but since he was in London in 1643, his exile could have endured only seventeen years at the most. We may assume that the period of banishment *approached* twenty years, and that Killigrew left England not long after his departure from London. We might prefer to believe that he remained longer (as his brothers did) to fight for his Prince, but we must remember that Thomas had two enemies in England—the Roundheads and his creditors. We may also remind ourselves that he had precedent among the nobility for leaving England in the thick of the conflict; the exodus began early, and the alacrity shown by certain picturesque cavaliers in leaving the scenes of bloodshed is altogether disillusioning. We may approach our problem now from a different angle. When Killigrew left London, he was without friends and, at this time, held no military commission. He would naturally seek the royal court and attach himself to it as his customary means of subsistence. The royal family came together for a time in 1643, and then separated, never to be completely reunited again. Since it appears that Killigrew left England early, we may inquire as to which of the royal households he could have joined to be taken soonest into exile. King Charles remained in England until the tragic end, Prince James until 1648, and Prince Charles until 1646. But Queen Henrietta Maria sailed for France in 1644. It seems quite probable that Thomas Killigrew sailed with her.

[11] Cf. Chap. V, p. 144.

At the time when Killigrew received from Parliament his pass to go to Oxford, the King was holding his court at that center, and his troops were indulging from time to time in a little harmless pageantry. Thomas's brother was there commanding the second troop of horse guarding His Majesty's person.[12] In the very month when Killigrew was discharged, the Queen came to Oxford to join her husband. In April, 1644, she went to Exeter where she gave birth to her last child, the Princess Henrietta. Somewhat broken in health and spirits, she proceeded into Cornwall, and on July 14, 1644, she sailed away from the port of Falmouth. If Killigrew was in her train, he must have watched Pendennis fort disappearing over the stern of his ship, the old castle so closely associated with the fortunes of his family.

Of course it is quite possible that Killigrew left England under quite different auspices, but in that case we have no clue as to what these auspices may have been. It is unnecessary to assume that he remained with the Queen after her arrival on the continent. In 1654 he was describing himself as a seasoned soldier,[13] and since he seems to have done no fighting in England, and certainly had done none between 1647 and 1654, it may be that his early military career was embraced by those few years of which we know nothing. Many exiled Royalists became soldiers of fortune on the continent, and in this way eked out their existence. Killigrew describes such a one:

[12] Anthony à Wood, *History and Antiquities of Oxford,* J. Gutch, Ed., 3 vols., Oxford, 1792–96, II, 466.

[13] Cf. *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* Folio, 1664, *passim.*

. . . an English Souldier . . . and one of the Kings party, three titles to perpetual poverty; a race of men who have left praying, or hoping for daily bread; and only relye upon nightly drink.[14]

Considering Killigrew's later successes on the continent, it appears unlikely that he surrendered himself to a life of debauchery, but he may have sold his sword—to the States-general, to Spain, or to some Italian prince. If this were so, the absence of records concerning his first years in exile would be the more understandable. In 1647 we come again to actual records, and are able to leave the realm of conjecture.

It is difficult to write of Killigrew's career from 1647 to 1660 without delving continually into the history of the Exile.[15] His affairs were closely linked with those of the banished princes; and he was actively concerned in the expedients, intrigues, and "mad factions" (as Clarendon sometimes called them) among the itinerant Royalists. In July, 1646, Prince Charles came to France and was tucked under the rather oppressive wing of his mother. The King of France increased Henrietta Maria's pension so as to provide for the maintenance of the Prince; but the Queen was so anxious to conceal the fact that her son was supported by this means, that she doled him out money as though it came from her own funds. The servants of the prince

[14] *Ibid.*, Part I, Act II, Scene 4, Folio, 1664, p. 342.

[15] No documentation is offered here for facts concerning important historical persons or events. The works of Edward, Earl of Clarendon, and the prefatory essays in the volumes published by the office of the Master of the Rolls in Great Britain have been consulted most frequently for historical background in the present study.

> . . . were to be contented with what should be allowed, which was dispensed with a very sparing hand; nor was the prince himself ever master of ten pistoles to dispose as he pleased.[16]

This situation was very painful to the seventeen-year-old heir to the throne of England, and out of his dissatisfaction seems to have arisen his early relationship with Thomas Killigrew. Killigrew became the unofficial purveyor of spending money to His Royal Highness. The dramatist was double the age of the Prince, and the latter's recollections of his father's servant must have been rather dim upon his arrival in France. We may wonder just how Charles came to employ Killigrew so soon after he reached Paris. Those who have adopted the traditional view of Killigrew as a rake and a "merry wag" have taken it for granted that he and "Old Rowley" should have drifted together. But the idea of their striking up a friendship as two *bons vivants* at this period is absurd. Perhaps Killigrew had kept up some contact with Henrietta Maria's household, and was in Paris when Charles arrived. He certainly would have had admission to the Prince's circle, not only because of his past services to the Queen but because of his kinship with Lord Jermyn[17] who was arbiter of the Queen's affairs and therefore of her son's. A document has come down to us dated April 20, 1647, and bearing the autograph *Carolus P;* it urges that *Thomas Killegrewe Armiger, dilectus & fidelis serviens noster,* be kindly received in those parts of Italy which he designs to visit.[18] No clue of the pur-

[16] Edward, Earl of Clarendon, *op. cit.*, IV, 343.

[17] See Chapter I, note 80.

[18] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 2.

pose of the mission is given except such as may be conveyed by the phrase *negotiorum nostrorum caussâ,* but there is no doubt whatever of the reason Killigrew was sent. He was to borrow money for the Prince. Edward Hyde, the grave Chancellor of the Exchequer, had remained in Jersey when Charles first came to France; but even if he had been upon the scene, it is doubtful if he would have known of Killigrew's commission. The dramatist himself probably conceived the idea for the project, and his arrangements with Charles must have been semi-private in nature. Such arrangements may have been countenanced by the Lords Jermyn and Colepepper, but would scarcely have met the approval of Hyde and the more conservative members of the Prince's council.

We know little of Killigrew's actual movements in Italy during his first mission for Charles, except that he was in Padua July 14, 1647,[19] and had returned to France by March, 1648. We know more of the results of the mission. On March 17, Charles wrote to Sir Isaac Arston, Bart., that he "had heard of his affection from Thomas Killigrew,"[20] and among surviving memoranda in Killigrew's own hand are notes of letters of thanks to the gentlemen "that obliged me in Italy and furnished money upon his [Charles's] credit when I was last there."[21] A list of the names of the unfortunate gentlemen follows. England was doing a thriving

[19] He signed the visitor's register at the University. See a note by J. Isaacs, *The Review of English Studies,* III (1927), 75.

[20] *Historical MSS Commission,* Report on Pepys MSS at Magdalene College, Cambridge (1911), p. 279.

[21] *Ibid.,* p. 263.

business in Italian ports at this time, and Killigrew must have sought out, not only exiles, but such foreign representatives of English commercial concerns as had nourished a sentiment of allegiance to the crown. There was nothing especially culpable in the actions of either Charles or Killigrew, for all the Royalists were living upon hourly expectations of a return to opulence, when all debts might be discharged. When the opportunity to pay actually came, Charles seems to have proved recalcitrant in some cases. Strange negotiations concerning old money matters passed between him and Killigrew for years after the Restoration. A curious echo of the case of the Sir Isaac Arston mentioned above was heard forty years later. In 1687 (when Charles and Killigrew were both dead) Sarah Mortimer, wife of Dr. Mortimer, claimed that her brother, Sir Isaac Arston, had become a burden upon her in his old age; since Sir Isaac had loaned Charles money through Thomas Killigrew during the Exile, the worthy Mrs. Mortimer petitioned the crown for a position as "land waiter" for her son-in-law.[22] Here is a strange concatenation! Such complications as these lay far in the future.

Killigrew returned from Italy early in 1648, quite successful, as we have seen. The next time he was to serve Charles, it would be in a more exalted capacity, for then Charles would be King of England and Killigrew would be the royal ambassador. Temporarily,

[22] *Calendar of Treasury Books,* 1685–89, p. 1337. A case almost identical with this is recorded in *Ibid.,* 1679–80, p. 310. The amount loaned in this case was the considerable one of £820.

the dramatist entered the service of another exiled prince.

The Duke of York escaped from England in 1648, and in May of that year he settled at the Hague with his sister, the Princess of Orange. The English fleet mutinied against Parliament and followed the "Admiral" to Holland. Prince Charles, fearing that his younger brother might assume command of the fleet and outshine him, left Paris and hastened to Calais, accompanied by Prince Rupert, the Lords Hopton and Colepepper, and "other gentlemen," one of whom must have been Killigrew. At Calais the Prince learned that James had actually proceeded to Helvoetsluys to the fleet, so he hastened on to the Hague, where he was kindly received by the Prince of Orange. This is the period of rivalry between the two brothers as to which should command the English fleet on its projected expedition to England. Charles finally assumed command, and James remained in Holland. Killigrew also remained behind—as a groom of the bedchamber in the Duke's household.[23] When the two princes came together, Killigrew seems to have been transferred from the service of one to that of the other. His usefulness had been tested, and perhaps the transfer of this potential means of supplementing an exile's income was one of the concessions Charles made to James for preempting command of the fleet. On the other hand Killigrew may simply have applied for a vacant post in the Duke's household because none existed in that of

[23] *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers preserved in the Bodleian Library,* H. O. Coxe, Gen. Ed., 3 vols., Oxford, 1869–76, I, 445.

the Prince. The dramatist had influential friends among the attendants upon the Duke. His brother, Dr. Killigrew, was an adviser to His Highness; his cousin, Sir John Berkeley, was governor of the Duke's household; and his friend and kinsman by marriage, Henry Bennet, was the Duke's secretary, and was even at this time on terms of the greatest intimacy with both of the princes.[24] During the latter months of the year 1648 then, Killigrew was attending upon James at the Hague, and was perhaps making those connections in the court of the Prince of Orange which were to stand him in good stead a few years later. In January, 1649, James set out for France, arriving in Paris on the 13th of the following month. On the 5th of the same month Charles was proclaimed King of England, having returned from the expedition which had proved so ineffectual in saving his father's head. A few months later Killigrew left the household of James, and again entered the service of Charles—now King Charles II.

The new King took up his residence at St. Germain, and began to busy himself in affairs of state. He sent out ambassadors to the various European nations in order to make official announcement of his father's execution, to secure recognition for himself, and to prevent if possible the recognition of Commonwealth ambassadors. Will Murray was sent to Scotland, Sir John

[24] See the very personal correspondence between him and the Prince of Wales. *Miscellanea Aulica,* T. Brown, Ed., London, 1702, pp. 130–161. Thomas and his brother, as well as Berkeley and Bennett are mentioned in the one document (see above, note 23) in "A list of Servants which are to attend his Highness at Sea," Nov. 12, 1648. The relationship among these individuals has been established above. Cf. pp. 37–38n, 44n.

Cockram to Denmark and the German States, and Sir Edward Hyde and Lord Cottington to Spain. To Venice and the northern states of Italy, King Charles sent his former emissary, Thomas Killigrew. On May 1, 1649, the Duke of York affixed his signature to a document which seems to have served as combination appointment to office, leave of absence, and safe conduct: Whereas "our trusty and welbeloved Servant, Mr. Thomas Killigrew," is about to leave for foreign countries upon affairs "in which hee may bee longer Absent than wee expect" it is made known that he has been a faithful servant, has earned affection, and may expect future testimony of good will. Since the bearer has been promoted from "Groome of the Bedchamber" to "Gentleman of the Bedchamber Inordinary," he henceforth has "full Power to claim the Premiciis."[25] Apparently Thomas had proved an acceptable servant to the Duke, and was relinquished with some reluctance. To each of the several sets of instructions furnished him by Charles for his mission there is appended a sort of codicil, authorizing him "from tyme to tyme (not neglecting the Affairs We have committed to your Trust) to attend the Occasions of Our said dearest Brother."[26] Since the only "Occasions" likely to arise under the circumstances were such as might call for the borrowing of money upon the Duke's letters of credit, authorization for this sort of thing was probably intended.

It is a pleasant task to review the next few years of

[25] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 1.

[26] *Ibid.*, f. 4.

Killigrew's life, for investigation of this period has served to remove considerable stigma from the dramatist's name. His mission into Italy as envoy to Savoy and Florence and Resident at Venice brought upon him a disgrace which was largely undeserved. In commenting upon Killigrew's appointment and its result, Edward Hyde remarks:

> The ambassador of Venice, [Pietro Basadonna, stationed at Madrid] was a man as all that nation is, of great civility and much profession; he was the first who told the ambassadors [Hyde and Cottington] that the king their master had a resident at Venice; which was Mr. Killigrew; which they did not at first believe, having before they left St. Germain dissuaded the king from that purpose; but afterwards his majesty was prevailed upon only to gratify him, that in that capacity he might borrow money of English merchants for his own subsistence; which he did, and nothing to the honour of his master; but was at last compelled to leave the republic for his vicious behaviour.[27]

This interpretation of the affair prevailed among Killigrew's contemporaries and has continued to prevail among succeeding generations. Killigrew is supposed to have lived riotously at Venice, and to have brought discredit upon his government. However, an examination of Killigrew's official papers, and of Venetian documents of the period, brings conclusive proof that the ambassador was expelled in order that the Republic of Venice might propitiate Cromwell's government.[28] The charges brought against his conduct were

[27] *The life of Edward Earl of Clarendon written by Himself,* Oxford, 1857, 2 vols., I, 232.

[28] Killigrew's papers, consisting of Charles's instructions and letters, of his own testimonials to the various Italian governments and their replies, and of notes concerning his correspondence with Secretary Long, are pre-

trumped up or exaggerated so that an excuse for the act might be sent to Charles Stuart. The Venetians were certainly men "of great civility and much profession," and in the dark ways of seventeenth century diplomacy they so far outclassed Killigrew that, among them, he was a shorn lamb tossed to the wolves. Actually, he served his Prince to the best of his ability, under the most adverse circumstances.

Before proceeding to Venice, Killigrew had to visit Savoy and Florence. His instructions, written out by Secretary Long, and his letters from Charles were dated at St. Germain August 20, and September 6, 1649. He was to tell of the "murder" of Charles I, and to send back "any Intelligence or Proposition that . . . may bee for the advantage of our Affairs," besides attending to the practical problems usually confronting an ambassador.[29] By November 12, he had arrived at Turin and had presented the King's letters to the Duke and Duchess of Savoy, addressed respectively as "Mon Cousin" and "Madame ma Tante." These missives, like the others entrusted to the ambassador, were short notes conveying thanks for past cordialities or letters of condolence, and asking that full trust be placed in the bearer—"le Sieur de Killigré."[30] Killigrew submitted his own testimonial to the Duke, asking for the

served among the Additional MSS at the British Museum, 20032, ff. 3–31. The papers of the Venetian government concerning the affair of the English Resident are calendared or reprinted in *State Papers Venetian,* 1647–52, and have been available only since 1927. When the same material is present in both these sources, reference is made to the more accessible source.

[29] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, ff. 3, 4.

[30] Ibid., f. 17. Thomas became de Killigré, Killigraeus, and Chiligreo according to the language of negotiation.

freedom of the port of Villafranche for the King's ships so that prizes might be brought in and disposed of, and for protection for any accredited officers of Parliament wishing to transfer their allegiance to the King. On November 14, Manuel answered Killigrew's letter, signifying his consent to the various requests.[31] The ambassador then resumed his journey, heartened perhaps by his first success.

But Killigrew's reception at Turin did not prove prophetic of his future experiences. Because of family relationships with Charles, the government of Savoy was predisposed to be friendly; moreover the ambassador had not asked for money or armed assistance. Nevertheless even Duke Manuel attached a proviso to his concessions. Safety was guaranteed to Englishmen coming over to the King's side,

> . . . a Condition qu'il [Killigrew] ne sera point permis aux subiets de Ma^te^ Brit. de dogmatizer en aucuns lieux des Estats de S. A. R. [the territories of the Duke] au prejudice de la Religion Catolique Apostolique Romaine.

This mild injunction only serves as a suggestion of the fact that Killigrew did not represent a popular cause, religiously or politically. The Italians were fully aware of the power of the Commonwealth and of the weak position of the young King. Killigrew had many obstacles to overcome. He was practically isolated at times when he needed official support. Charles left for Jersey about the time when Killigrew set out for Turin; and during much of the latter's residency at Venice, the King was engaged in his English campaign. Communi-

[31] *Ibid.*, f. 18.

cation was difficult, and many of the ambassador's letters were never answered. A reply was sent to his first report from Turin—but "noe thanks to the duke as I begd mit be sent."[32] There were other difficulties. The ambassador lacked the linguistic equipment for his work. His official papers are written in French, Italian, and Latin, in only one of which languages could Killigrew have been proficient. He seems to have been blessed with a competent secretary, but this at best was a sorry shift. Finally there was the problem of funds. Charles was not in a position to finance an expedition of this kind, and Killigrew was probably expected to be self-supporting—a fact which contributed to his final difficulties.

After leaving Turin, Killigrew visited Genoa and Leghorn to confirm the consuls;[33] and then, after touching at Pisa, he proceeded to his second major destination at Florence. He carried royal messages for the Duke and Duchess, for Prince Leopoldo de Medici, Prince Mathias, and the Cardinal. The reason he was so well provided with letters in this case is suggested by his instructions, which read in part:

> YOU shall in all the severall Places apply yourself in Our name to . . . such Princes of Florence as have power and you shall find inclinable to assist our desire of borrowing money of the Duke. . . . The Somme you shall move him to furnish us withall shall be Ten thousand Pistolls.[34]

The Duke proved cold—not only to this request, but to

[32] Killigrew's notes on his correspondence, British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 30.

[33] *Ibid.*, and *Historical MSS Commission,* Pepys MSS (1911), p. 263.

[34] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 21.

other suits which Killigrew urged. He refused to commit anything to writing, but made his position clear in an interview of which Killigrew has left minutes. The government of Florence expressed its good wishes to Charles and promised that his ships and merchants should receive the same treatment as those of other monarchs. As far as agreeing to refuse recognition to Cromwell's envoys was concerned, the government could not commit itself. On the two remaining points, the stand was all too definite. The Duke could not supply the King with military aid and "make a Powerful Enemy having so many great ones already"; and as for lending money, his treasury was so exhausted "that he was not able to pay his Meniall Servants nor support his owne Occasions."[35] Killigrew went on his way.

By Feb. 14, 1650, the amateur diplomatist had arrived at his final destination at Venice. He presented a letter from Charles to the Doge, Francesco Molino; and a long epistle of his own to the Senate. In its way this curious composition is a masterpiece. The Latin is certainly that of Killigrew's secretary, but the contents are just as certainly Killigrew's own. The story of the rebellion is reviewed, and the actions of the rebels are painted in Stygian hues. There is a detailed and blood-curdling account of the execution of Charles I. Certain arabesque decorations are included and are particularly amusing. Realizing that the most dangerous enemies of the Venetians were the Turks, Killigrew slipped into his description of the anarchistic realm of England information

[35] *Ibid.*, f. 23.

. . . of the publication of the Alcaron, translated from the Turkish, so that people may be imbued with Turkish manners, which have much in common with the actions of the rebels.

Then the artist approached his audience upon its religious side, and told how

The Church of St. Paul, comparable with St. Peter's at Rome, remains desolate and is said to have been sold to the Jews as a synagogue. The choir will be profaned by the voices of the infidel as soon as they receive possession from the troops of soldiers, horse and foot, lodged there.

The testimonial ends with an earnest plea for sympathy and assistance.[36] Five days later Killigrew was summoned by the Senate to the Collegio to be informed that he had been cordially received. Letters were sent to Venetian ambassadors abroad, informing them of the action of the Senate and stating that sympathy had been expressed "in general terms."[37]

For over two years Killigrew remained as Resident of King Charles II at Venice. He seems never to have completely mastered Italian. A year after his arrival he was described as coming to the Collegio with his testimonials, and tendering them mutely.[38] Until the end he continued to apologize for his Italian and to ask that messages be put in writing that he might make more certain of their contents. He presented to the Senate nineteen testimonials in all;[39] most of these

[36] Two copies of this document are among Killigrew's papers, ff. 5–8; 25–29. The version quoted above is printed in *Calendar of State Papers Venetian,* 1647–52, pp. 136–140.

[37] *Calendar of State Papers Venetian,* 1647–52, p. 141.

[38] *Ibid.,* p. 173.

[39] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, ff. 5–16. Copies of most of these survive in Italy and have been calendared among the State Papers Venetian.

were never answered, but they continued to express the writer's unflagging zeal. During Charles's English campaign, Killigrew submitted reports of glorious victories. At fitting intervals he would tell of Cromwell's complete rout in Ireland, or of the death of Cromwell's son; and some time before news could have reached his part of the world, he described a great Royalist victory at Worcester![40] When a representative of the Senate went among the foreign ambassadors to report a Venetian victory over the Turks, the English Resident was reported to have been in danger of "succumbing of overjoy."[41] Killigrew seems certainly to have done his best. It is unnecessary to review in detail the Resident's official transactions, although considerable information on this head is available. A few minor concessions concerning shipping and the appointment of consuls were gained, but requests for money and arms were consistently ignored. The dramatist found ample time for his own diversions, and his leisure was occupied with the writing of plays. *Cicilia and Clorinda* and *Bellamira her Dream*, each in two parts, were written during this sojourn in Italy. These plays are long dramatic romances, never intended for the stage. Together with *The Parson's Wedding* and *The Pilgrim*, a tragedy written earlier in the Exile, these new works brought the total number of Killigrew's unpublished productions up to six.[42] All in all there seems to have been nothing especially "vicious" in Killigrew's general conduct.

[40] *Calendar of State Papers Venetian*, 1647–52, *passim*.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[42] The date of these plays is discussed below.

In June, 1651, the dramatist experienced some unpleasantness with the Venetian authorities. His prestige had never been great in the city, and the Senate did not hesitate to take him to task on this occasion. It appears that certain individuals had assumed his livery simply to share the immunities from the law enjoyed by the servants of foreign ministers. Killigrew promised to dismiss these servants, of whose actions "repugnant to his character and to his birth," he professed ignorance.[43] Since their offense had consisted only of smuggling after all, and since Killigrew was necessitous and of Cornish stock, it is probable that he exaggerated both the extent of his ignorance and the degree of his horror for the crime. During the following year several similar episodes occurred. Killigrew urged in self-justification that his servants were of the same class as those employed by other foreign ministers; that a certain latitude had been formerly granted to Venetian ambassadors at London; and that nothing transpired at his house which was uncommon in the houses of ambassadors at Venice.[44] There is no doubt that the Resident had committed certain irregularities. He had to support himself, and the means he adopted were common in his day. Commodities were permitted to enter his house duty free from English ships, and not all of these were for his own use. In the end he admitted frankly that a little retailing had been done at his establishment. What Killigrew said in his own defense was quite true, for the offense was not so serious

[43] *Calendar of State Papers Venetian,* 1647–52, pp. 180–190.
[44] *Ibid.,* pp. 196–197, 248.

that it could not be winked at when the offender was the representative of a powerful monarch. Charles was not a powerful monarch, and his Resident was to suffer cruelly for his misdemeanors.

All the time that Killigrew had been submitting his exuberant testimonials at the Collegio, the Senate was receiving more accurate information from its spies. The Venetians were merely waiting until they could gauge the relative strength of Charles and Cromwell before deciding how to act toward the English Resident. In September, 1651, the Royalist army was almost annihilated at Worcester. After news of this reverse had reached Venice, the treatment accorded Killigrew became more peremptory. Action was hastened by a report dispatched in the spring of 1652 by Lorenzo Paulucci, Venetian Secretary in England. An interview with an "English Official" was described, and the words of that stout gentleman furnish a refreshing contrast to the creeping chicanery of the Venetians:

> "We admire the discreet policy of Venice but do not recognize it on this occasion: She puts up with a subaltern of Charles Stuart, and we are acquainted both with his proposals and the answers. We laughed at them." [45]

A formal complaint of Killigrew's customs evasions was secured from "the Proveditorie over the slaughter houses" on June 20, 1652; and two days later it was moved in the Senate that the English Resident be dismissed.[46] The secretary sent to inform Killigrew of this decision has left a singularly detailed account of

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 227.
[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 246–249.

the interview. It seems to have been not altogether lacking in drama and pathos. The Resident, according to his own report, had just been recalled anyway; and the action of the Senate came as a complete surprise. The interview took place in a pergola at Killigrew's house at San Cassano. "From the change in his countenance," reported the messenger, "I noticed how bitter this was to him. Almost with tears in his eyes he remarked that he had received hard and cruel blows in his life, but this was the worst thing that ever happened to him." Killigrew then told of the extent of his trespasses and repeated his justification. "What shall I do?" he asked, "Shall I go to the Collegio?" The messenger curtly replied that he should not. "I can say no more," said Killigrew, "except that I am the minister of an unfortunate King, and provided he does not lose the esteem and protection of the Republic, which he values so highly, it matters little what descends upon me." As he bowed the messenger from the pergola, the distressed Englishman remarked desperately that he "had found another and less expensive house at San Fantino." The dry comment of the Italian was, that under the circumstances that fact was not important.[47]

The Resident was refused further admittance to the Collegio, and he departed the city. The Venetians sent a report to England that the Royalist minister had been informed that the arms of the Commonwealth were to be substituted for the arms of the King.[48] Another

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 247–248. The quotations are from the messenger's report.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

kind of missive was sent to Paris; and this provides the best comment upon the whole affair. The ambassadors Morosini and Sagredo were notified in these terms:

> The Senate seeing that the Parliamentarians would be pleased at the departure of the royalist Resident, and to avoid the appearance of dismissing him at their request, has decided to send him away, the smuggling at his house affording a pretext. . . . If anyone speaks to you on this subject . . . you will employ your usual address and justify the action, alleging the laxity of Mr. Killigrew. . . . As able ministers as you will understand the intention of the state. If a hint be given you of the possibility of appointing another minister, you will evade the subject, parrying any such project with such cautious address as your own prudence will suggest to you.[49]

The interview for which the ministers had been so fully prepared actually occurred; and in August Sagredo, with apparent relish for his own cleverness, reported that he had met the English Majesty's agent and had painted Killigrew's behavior as "intolerable." In due time Sagredo received the commendation of his government.[50] The interview had probably been with Sir Richard Browne, English Ambassador at Paris. In November Hyde wrote to Browne, informing him that the King had been advised of the Venetian Ambassador's explanation and was prepared to examine Killigrew's miscarriage. Although the Chancellor was not inclined to champion Killigrew's cause, he did say, on this occasion, that immunities had been enjoyed by foreign ambassadors in the past, and the action of Venice appeared rather irregular, especially at this time

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 250.
[50] *Ibid.*, pp. 265, 268, 276.

when the low state of the King's affairs made him a particular sufferer from foreign slights.[51] Hyde may have had a faint inkling of the truth, but, on the whole, Venetian diplomacy had proved successful; and Killigrew could not anticipate a pleasant reception at court after his negotiations.

He seems to have realized his position, and to have avoided an immediate return to Paris. Having left one Joseph Kent in charge of affairs at Venice,[52] he proceeded to the Hague, where he had friends. The reappearance of the dramatist in the north was greeted by a lampoon from the pen of John Denham:

> Our Resident *Tom,*
> From *Venice* is come,
> And hath left the Statesman behind him;
> Talks at the same pitch,
> Is as wise, is as rich,
> And just where you left him, you find him.
>
> But who says he was not,
> A man of much Plot,
> May repent that false Accusation;
> Having plotted and penn'd
> Six plays to attend
> The Farce of his Negotiation.

The next two stanzas concern Will Murray, and Denham himself. The verses conclude:

> These three when they drink,
> How little do they think
> Of Banishment, Debts or dying?

[51] *Evelyn's Diary,* IV, 249.

[52] *Cal. of Clarendon State Papers,* II, 176; and British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 30.

Not old with their years,
Nor cold with their fears;
But their angry Stars still defying.

Mirth makes them not mad,
Nor Sobriety sad;
But of that they are seldom in danger:
At *Venice*, at *Rome*
At the *Hague* they are at home;
The good Fellow is no where a stranger.[53]

Apparently Killigrew was in contact with a literary circle on the continent just as he had been in England. In his own works there is a reference to a famous dinner of roast pig at the St. John's Head at the Hague:

It was where we met Embassadour Will [Murray], and Resident Tom [Killigrew], with M. Sheriff's Secretary [Will Crofts], John the Poet with the nose [Denham]; all Gondibert's [Davenant's] dire foes.[54]

Only a few of Killigrew's companions are mentioned here, and the passage probably alludes to the group with which he foregathered at the Hague in 1652. All

[53] "On Mr. Tho. Killigrew's Return from his Embassie from Venice, and Mr. William Murray's from Scotland," *The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham*, T. H. Banks, Jr., Ed., Yale Press, 1928, pp. 111–112. I have followed the reading of a copy of the poem which exists among the Clarendon MSS in substituting "Venice" for "Paris" in the last stanza.

[54] *Thomaso or the Wanderer*, Part II, Act V, Scene 7, Folio, 1864, p. 456. An author's note of the identity of the individuals alluded to in the text is printed in the margin of the folio. As time went on, these friends of Killigrew were all honored with titles or orders; for some reason Killigrew never was. The author's note does not inform us that "Gondibert" indicates Davenant, but the fact is obvious. The poet was the object of considerable persiflage among other cavaliers, and when a portion of *Gondibert* was printed in Paris in 1650, Denham parodied it. Cf. his "Game of Chess," T. H. Banks, *Poetical Works of Sir John Denham*, p. 113. Most of the cavaliers mentioned had recently returned from foreign embassies, more or less successful. Cf. *Ibid., passim.*

of Killigrew's time was not spent in feasting with his friends or submitting to their badinage. In August, 1652, two months after his dismissal from Venice, he was writing to his friend Proger to explain the unfortunate conclusion of his mission, and to ask for intercession with the King.[55] It was not very long before a reconciliation was effected. Temporarily Killigrew found employment in the household of the Duke of Gloucester, youngest son of Charles I. Cromwell had finally permitted this youth to leave England; toward the end of 1652 he had taken up his residence with his sister, the Princess of Orange, and the continent had another heir presumptive upon its shores. Since Killigrew had already attended one prince while he enjoyed the protection of the House of Orange, it is probable that he had little difficulty in associating himself with the attendants of Gloucester, whose arrival at the Hague had been so opportune. There is no direct evidence of Killigrew's connection with Gloucester (the fifth member of the royal family to employ him) until 1653. In May of that year the Duke joined Queen Henrietta Maria and King Charles in Paris, and Thomas was among the gentlemen to accompany him upon the journey.[56]

The dramatist found Paris a city of "sad enchantment" for the Royalists in 1653. The years 1652–1654 were among the blackest of the Exile. About 1654

[55] *Cal. of the Clarendon State Papers,* 1869–76, II, 142. The letter does not indicate which of the Proger brothers was addressed, but Edward was probably the one since he was in most constant personal attendance upon Charles.

[56] *Historical MSS Commission,* Seventh Report, Appendix, Part I (1879), p. 459.

Killigrew wrote his last play, *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* a comedy in two parts; and although the play is about the least stageworthy of Killigrew's productions and shares the coarseness of *The Parson's Wedding,* it is extremely interesting for its autobiographical suggestions and its witty comment upon contemporary conditions. Killigrew describes the life he was sharing. Of the mood of the Royalists he says:

> . . . The Dogs are so muzled and ty'd up at home, with Constables and [C]romwel, they fight for sport abroad.
>
> *Carlo.* I have seen one of those painted staves disarm a Scarlet Cloke, and command him into the stocks without resistance; and here they are so sullen they will not give the wall to St. Jago, unless he be painted upon it. . . . They are as proud of their persecution as the Jews; and brag as vainly of their wants as a Castillian would of his blood; no servants, no money, no clothes, no meat, and always afoot, neither daunts nor dejects them; they beg as confidently their surly way, and they think as meritoriously as Capuchins; By this light, I believe 'twill be an order in time, they are admitted into the Mendicants already: and those that lov'd the man least call'd their great Charles both Saint and Martyr.

The extreme poverty of the English court is described in a most amusing way:

> . . . France has so cut their combs; the Louvre and the Pale-royal have been sad inchanted Castles to them, they have kept a Lazarello's Court there; darkness, leanness and the nest of Poverty; but two loaves a day, and without fish, to work the Miracle; yet the Gallery was a Christian Coney-warren fill'd with Cavaliers of all Trades; and unless they fed upon their children, 'tis not visible what they eat.
>
> *Carlo.* They are now remov'd to the Palace Royal . . . where there is not a blade of Grass left in the Garden, nor a drop of Oyl

in the Madona's Lamps; sacriledge and their Sallads made it burn dim; they are happy that swim, they dive in the pond and steal the Fish. The younger stomacks brouse upon the Cops as high as they can reach, they have starv'd the poor Antelope in eating up his Commons; their Grandees only dine, and that but when fortune smiles . . . there's their Resident too, his Arms are up still; but 'tis long since he had the Supporters; 'tis thought he eat the Unicorn last Passover. . . .[57]

There is considerably more of this, and of numerous allusions to important historical personages who can easily be recognized. The dramatist has actually used as a character in the play "Harrigo," Henry Proger, ringleader of the Royalist assassins of Antony Ascham, Commonwealth ambassador to Madrid in 1650.[58] Killigrew was in the very thick of Royalist affairs. Interesting evidence of this has come down to us in a set of keys to six different ciphers he used when communicating with Secretary Long, with his friends, Proger and Elliott, and with his sisters, Elizabeth and Katherine.[59] The ciphers were numerical, each letter of the alphabet being represented by three different figures which might be used alternately to indicate that letter. Common words and proper names of frequent occurrence were represented by special numerical symbols, and it is

[57] *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* Part I, Act III, Scene 1, Folio, 1664, pp. 343–44. This play is supposed to have been written in Madrid, although no evidence has turned up to indicate that a journey to that city interrupted the author's residence in Paris at this time. It may be that he was sent to Madrid (to borrow money) late in 1653 or early in 1654. See below, Chapter VII, p. 228n.

[58] Proof of the identity of "Harrigo" is offered below, Chapter VII, p. 227.

[59] British Museum Additional MSS, 33596, ff. 21–32. A seventh key, used apparently by Henry Killigrew, is among these manuscripts.

this feature of the keys that makes them interesting. Among the hundreds of names listed are those of Thomas's own kin, such as "Dr. Killigrew" and "Sister Boyle"; names of literary figures, such as "Endymion Porter" and "Abr. Cowley"; and names of other exiles, from Charles and his peers on down to individuals whose identity has been completely obscured by time. A register of the Exile is thus provided, and the political and social aspects of Killigrew's correspondence is indicated.

There were numerous factions among the Royalists, and Killigrew was aligned not with the more conservative "constitutional Royalists" such as Chancellor Hyde, Ambassador Browne, and Secretary Nicholas, but with the gallants, "the Fair and Kind Friends of the Prince Palatine Polyxander" (Prince Rupert), to whom he dedicated his last play. Something like a feud seems to have existed between Killigrew and Hyde. Unfriendly remarks of the Chancellor concerning the dramatist have already been quoted, and there is no doubt that Killigrew was careful to fan the flame of his grave senior's animosity. In November, 1653, Sir Richard Browne dispatched to the Chancellor in "Mr. Kellegrew's care, a butt of canary wine divided into three barrells." These were to be distributed about the court, with Hyde as the ministering angel. But according to a lugubrious letter received by Sir Richard, the wine met another fate. Hyde wrote:

> I heare the Canary Wyne is come to Paris, but no men'con of the delivery of it, being conceaved to be Mr. Killigrew's owne wyne, so that I expecte a very small share of it.[60]

[60] *Evelyn's Diary*, IV, 288. In this particular instance I have assumed that "Mr. Killigrew" refers to Thomas.

Repercussions of the feud between Hyde and Killigrew occurred after the Restoration: Killigrew's eldest son is reputed to have been chief among the courtiers who attempted to prevent the match between the Chancellor's daughter and the Duke of York,[61] and Killigrew himself was fond of making jokes upon his old enemy for a long time.[62] Apparently his enemies never succeeded in injuring Killigrew with King Charles. On Oct. 2, 1654, Lord Hatton wrote to Secretary Nicholas asking if one Colonel Warren was "yett of his M's Bedchamber." He remarked that he "hoped it would be soe, as much as wee hoped and were assured by Mr. Chancellor that Tho. Killigrew should not be."[63] But, the month before, Hyde had been obliged to number Killigrew in the list of servants henceforth to compose His Majesty's household,[64] and the coveted position as Groom of the Bedchamber was later conferred upon him.

Killigrew did not remain with the King long after June, 1654, when the court took its final departure from Paris. A complete alteration in the dramatist's circumstances took place late in 1654. The cavalier was no longer young, and he seems to have desired to rest his future security upon something more substantial than the prospects of the King. He courted and won Charlotte de Hesse, a Dutch woman seventeen years his junior and an heiress to ten thousand pounds. It

[61] *Memoirs of Count Grammont,* G. Goodwin, Ed., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1908, I, 164.

[62] *Pepys' Diary,* July 6, 1668.

[63] "The Nicholas Papers," G. F. Warner, Ed., *Camden Soc. Publications,* 1886–1897, II, 93.

[64] *Cal. of Clarendon State Papers,* II, 386.

has been remarked that Killigrew's first marriage was a love match. In *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* semi-autobiographical in nature and written about the time of his courtship of Charlotte, we get an intimation of his motives for his second marriage. Thomaso says:

> . . . this life of mine, that which some men may pass some moments in for humour, but no trade for men of honour; Wisdom and Conscience bids us seek a Nest ere Age and Diseases find us; . . . 'tis sad to be out of doors in the Winter of our Age. A gray Wanderer is but a bad Tragedy to himself, though an old Beggar may be a Comedy to others: These thoughts, and the noble nature of this vertuous Maid, have made me resolve to abjure this humour; and having bid farewel to all the follies of my youth vow my whole thoughts to the friendship of the fair Serulina, a maid, whose Dower and Beauty may satisfie . . .[65]

Poor Charlotte with her ten thousand pounds seems to have been made almost the object of a Royalist conspiracy, for the King himself wrote to her on Killigrew's behalf.[66] Success crowned the campaign, and the marriage took place at the Hague on January 28, 1655.[67]

Killigrew had had nothing to offer to match the fortune of his wife except his prospects from the favor of King Charles. He had urged these, and in order that he might keep face among his bride's friends, something had to be done for him. His best friend proved to be Charles's aunt, Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, an amiable personage who had previously taken an interest in the fortunes of the Killigrews. The

[65] *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* Part II, Act IV, Scene 9, Folio, 1664, p. 438.

[66] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 44.

[67] The Killigrew Bible: see above, Chap. II, note 1.

Queen wrote several letters urging that Charles recommend Killigrew to Prince William for an appointment to a command. In one letter to Secretary Nicholas she remarked:

> . . . it will make him to subsist untill the King be able to doe for him, and his wives frends have putt him upon it . . . ; it will be a great honour for him the King's writing because his wives frends will by that [know] his Ma^ties^ favour to him.[68]

Apparently his royal benefactress succeeded in her endeavors, for Killigrew entered the service of the States-general, and we have the record of at least one service he performed during the years that followed. In July, 1655, he was reported at Cologne as having been sent on from Holland to make arrangements for a visit by the Princess Royal.[69] It appears probable that the dramatist continued to function under his new masters as a courtier, rather than as a military man.

For the few remaining years of the Exile, Killigrew must have settled down to a fairly inconspicuous domestic life. He seems to have enjoyed the rights of Dutch citizenship, and to have maintained an establishment at Maestricht. In December of the year of his marriage, "at 3 oclocke and quarter in the morning," Madame Charlotte bore him a son, Charles. Before the Restoration two more sons, Thomas and Robert, were added to the Killigrew family.[70] Harry Killigrew, the dramatist's son by his first wife, crossed over to the continent toward the end of the Exile, having probably

[68] *Evelyn's Diary,* IV, 225–26.

[69] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1655, p. 225.

[70] The Killigrew Bible: see above, Chap. II, note 1; see also "Act for Naturalization," April 3, 1662, *Lords Journals,* XI, 420.

been reared in England by some of his mother's relatives. There is no evidence of intercourse between Killigrew and his eldest son at this period, although it is highly probable that it was the dramatist who secured the youth a place in the household of the Duke of York. Harry became a courtier and a scoundrel. His career will be touched upon again, since it is largely owing to his actions that his father's name has been one of such ill repute down to our own day. Killigrew's married life in Holland was not completely free of financial complications. He still had his old creditors in England. The last bit of evidence connecting him with the continent presents the dramatist in a rather unfavorable light. No less a person than John Milton, writing for Richard and his Council, January 27, 1659, made a plea to the "High and Mighty, the States of West Friesland" that Killigrew, a commander in the service of the States, should not be permitted to evade his English debts. Milton wrote very feelingly of the case of one Mary Grinder who was suing Killigrew in the Dutch courts:

> If I only mention to your Highnesses that she, whom this man tries to deprive of nearly all her fortunes, is a widow, that she is poor, the mother of many little children, I will not do you the injustice of supposing that with you, to whom I am confident the divine Commandments, and especially those about not oppressing widows and the fatherless, are well known, any more serious argument will be needed against your granting this privilege of fraud to the man's petition.[71]

This intensity calls for a word or two of qualification. After all, Milton was writing about a well-known Royal-

[71] D. Masson, *The Life of Milton,* 7 vols., London & Camb., 1859–94, V, 575.

ist, and he exerted himself accordingly. It might be noted too that Mary Grinder's debt had been outstanding for eighteen years, so that her widowhood and her many little children were misfortunes too recently accruing to be used with justice in emphasizing Killigrew's delinquencies.

Little has been said in comment upon Killigrew's character as it is revealed by the records of his actions during the Exile. He seems to have developed a reputation as a *raconteur* and as a swaggerer as he grew older. Some indication of this is furnished by Denham's verses, and by the self-characterization in the dramatist's last play. In October, 1654, the Queen of Bohemia told how Killigrew "makes a rare relation of the Queen of Sueden";[72] and about the same time Joseph Jane wrote Nicholas that,

> Amb. Tom is here and his habit is noe proofe of a poore court, his mistris is now arrived. He discourses in other company as well as to me of his estate; what the persons interessed conceave of it I heare not.[73]

Killigrew always managed to cut a figure. As early as 1648, when he was serving the Duke of York, he had kept two servants when his brother Henry had kept none, and his friend Henry Bennet, future Earl of Arlington, had been contented with one.[74]

The money to pay his servants and to buy his rich "habit" must have come as his share of what he could borrow for the royal family. Nothing of a truly sinister nature attaches to his conduct during the Exile.

[72] *Evelyn's Diary*, IV, 214.

[73] "The Nicholas Papers," *Camden Soc. Pub.* (1886–97), II, 105.

[74] *Calendar of Clarendon State Papers*, I, 445.

The liaison between his sister, Elizabeth Boyle, and Charles II occurred about the time Killigrew was regaining the favor of the King after his expulsion from Venice; but to explain the King's favor on the basis of this coincidence would be eminently unfair. The Queen of Bohemia was also showing favor to Killigrew at this period, and it would be difficult to accuse her of ulterior motives. No new scandal has come to light from an investigation of the dramatist's middle life; on the contrary, some old scandal has been proven groundless. One is moved to a sort of admiration for the way Killigrew solved his problems during the difficult years of the Exile. He had lived comfortably, actively, and, in a sense, usefully; he had occupied his leisure by the writing of plays; at the end he was able to return to England in good spirits and in bodily vigor. His faults became more pronounced after the Restoration. Evidence of his swagger, his rough tongue, and his sharpness in money matters becomes more abundant. But, until the end, it is difficult to find anything to explain why he has been set aside as worse than the other courtiers of his century.

IV

A ROYAL FAVORITE

IN the spring of the year 1660 King Charles returned in triumph to his realm; and Thomas Killigrew, who had promptly turned his back upon the Netherlands, was in his troop of rejoicing courtiers. On May 24 Samuel Pepys, who was aboard the *Naseby* (later the *Charles*), set down in his Diary that

> . . . Walking upon the decks, were persons of honour all the afternoon, among others Thomas Killigrew, (a merry droll, but a gentleman of great esteem with the King) who told us many merry stories.

There is ample proof that Killigrew was truly "of great esteem with the King." When the court arrived in London, the homecoming cavaliers were convinced that Golconda had been reached, and the dramatist joined the others in besieging the King for favors. He desired the keepership of the armory at Greenwich, the right to appoint officers of excise in Munster, a parcel of white plate, value £1200, formerly the property of Oliver Cromwell.[1] His petitions continued, and many of them were granted. On November 18, 1661, he was granted along with eight other grooms of the bedchamber a yearly pension of £500; and this, with an annuity of £400 as former servant to Charles I, and another of £200 which he ultimately received as Master of the

[1] *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1660–61, pp. 101, 339; *Ibid., Ireland,* 1660–61, p. 470.

Revels, assured him a substantial income—contingent, of course, upon his ability to collect.[2] He received in addition special grants of money or commodities too numerous to particularize.[3] Some of the grants were simply made him as "royal bounty to support his necessary occasions;" others as "money which the King owes him." In the four years 1669–72 his name appears in the Treasury Books no less than forty-seven times. Occasionally his son Henry was named as a sharer in a bequest; at other times the son would simply act as the father's agent to jog the Lords of the Treasury.

With a yearly income that must have amounted to well over £2000, the dramatist was always in debt. He had his family to support, his theatrical ventures to finance; and, apparently, a host of personal extravagances to maintain. Lady Jermyn and other creditors sometimes preceded him to the Treasury;[4] and in December, 1667, two hapless citizens sued him in the courts. Killigrew pleaded the privilege of a King's servant and recommended that his prosecutors be brought to "condign punishment." The House of Lords granted his petition and the plaintiffs were compelled to withdraw their suit and pay all costs.[5] In order to supplement his income, the dramatist had recourse to his old practice of begging estates, forming temporary partnerships with other grooms of the bed-

[2] *Ibid., Domestic,* 1661–62, p. 150; *Cal. Treasury Papers* (and *Books*), 1660–67; 1667–68; 1669–72; 1673–75; *passim.*

[3] *Ibid., passim;* see also *Cal. State Papers, Ireland,* 1660–61, p. 430; 1663–65, p. 128; *Ibid., Domestic,* 1664–65, p. 302; 1670, p. 686.

[4] *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1667–68, p. 526.

[5] *Historical MSS Commission,* Eighth Report, Appendix, Part I (1881), Index; *Lords Journals,* XII, p. 169.

chamber, with the King's physicians, and upon occasion with John Denham and other notables. Again there is more evidence available than need be itemized.[6] The ugliness and probable injustice involved in the practice has already been commented upon.[7] If an agent was to secure the property of the criminal, in the detection and prosecution of whom he had invested money, it was necessary that he circumvent any pardon or reprieve. The tenacity of the courtiers is demonstrated by one instance in which Killigrew and Proger delayed for a considerable time the pardon of one Captain Booth, charged with coining. Their caveat against his release kept him in prison several years, until in desperation his friends decided "that the way to have it [the caveat] taken off is to satisfy these two bed chambermen."[8] Unless one is credulous enough to believe that the courtiers of Charles Stuart were interested in the enforcement of the law, it is impossible to find an excuse for Killigrew's activities; but we should bear in mind that in censuring him we must censure the whole court of the "Merry Monarch."

Not all of Killigrew's influence at court was used in a selfish manner. He could protect the interests of his sister, Lady Shannon; expedite the payment of her pension for Lady Sayer; secure a consulship for a friend; and put himself to some trouble to mitigate the

[6] *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1660–61, p. 371; 1661–62, p. 88; 1663–64, pp. 360, 497; 1664–65, p. 423; 1665–66, p. 188; 1667, p. 116; 1668–69, pp. 318, 416, 645, 657; 1670, p. 133; 1671, p. 382; 1672–73, p. 387; 1676–77, p. 162; *Ibid., Ireland,* 1660–69, p. 656; *Cal. Treasury Papers,* 1667–68, pp. 42, 89, 396, 602.

[7] See above, Chap. II, p. .

[8] *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1673–75, p. 178.

punishment of some unfortunate, unjustly sentenced to transportation.[9] When the "gentlemen of Chesire" wished to save a former loyalist from the severity of the law, they commissioned the Countess of Derby to approach Killigrew through his wife.[10] The secret agent, Aphra Behn, when neglected and in want in Antwerp, and when prosecuted for debt after her return, considered Thomas Killigrew the most likely person to take her pleas for relief to the King.[11]

To his activities as courtier, as retriever of fines and forfeited estates, and as habitual petitioner to the King, Killigrew added a number of business enterprises which make his Restoration career resemble the career of his father during earlier reigns. Without bothering to secure a title for himself, he was able to secure (for a consideration) titles for others. W. Dugdale in a letter to one John Langley, dated August 30, 1660, told how an old lady had managed to have confirmed to her the title of a duchess. Difficulties had been encountered, and—

> . . . not[withstand]ing that Sir Edw. Walker and the secretary [Nicholas] could not set the whole agoing, one Doctor B. (one of the Kings Physicians), and one Thomas Killigrew (an old courtier), as I am credibly in pri[vate] informed, did the business not

[9] *Ibid.*, 1673–75, p. 408; 1667–68, pp. 233, 181; 1673–75, p. 388.

[10] *Ibid.*, 1664–65, p. 354.

[11] Aphra Behn's letters to Killigrew are most interesting and pathetic. They have been calendared among the state papers, and one has been reprinted by Montague Summers, *The Works of Aphra Behn*, 6 vols., London, 1915, I, xxvi. There is no specific evidence of what Killigrew did to aid Mrs. Behn, but the presence of her letters among the state papers is a fair indication that he attempted to have some official action taken on them.

without a good reward you may be sure. Mr. William . . . told me it was £500 . . . and the women are highly pleased.[12]

This was one form of enterprise. Some years later the dramatist purchased of the King a cargo of silks, china, and damask from the *Golden Phoenix,* an East Indian prize[13]—apparently that he might dispose of it at a profit. Thomas had obviously inherited his father's versatility. Many of his projects arose out of his position as reversioner to the office of Master of the Revels, it being understood that he was to succeed Sir Henry Herbert in that office as early as 1662. In this year the petition of the King's coachman "for the keeping of such outlandish beasts as shall be presented to his Majesty by the Russian ambassador" was referred to the dramatist that he might determine "whether the request may be granted without prejudice to the apes and bears of the bear garden and their masters."[14] He received with a company of others a license to conduct competitions in shooting with the long bow, in wrestling, and running.[15] Again acting with others, he at-

[12] *Historical MSS Commission,* Fifth Report, Appendix, Part I (1876), p. 176.

[13] *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1667–68, p. 554.

[14] *Ibid.,* 1661–62, p. 574. The document is dated November 28, 1662. Killigrew's relations with Herbert are somewhat puzzling. During the early years of the Restoration, Herbert waged vigorous war upon the theatrical monopolists, Davenant and Killigrew, and in June, 1662, Killigrew seems to have surrendered unconditionally to the enemy. (L. Hotson, *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage,* Harvard University Press, 1928, p. 248.) Nevertheless the dramatist seems to have performed some of Herbert's functions during the succeeding years (see above and *Notes and Queries,* First Series, I, 219). Although Thomas surrendered the reversion to Herbert's office to his son Charles in 1668 (*Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1667–68, p. 257), he himself succeeded Herbert in 1673.

[15] *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1664–65, p. 286.

tempted to rent for 1000 marks a year rights to the "Pricking Book Lottery" conducted by Sir Antony Desmarces for the Royal Fishing Company.[16] For years he sought to put into execution a project whereby a company might rent the privilege of selling licenses to peddlers.[17]

Of course Killigrew's chief business activity during the Restoration period (and that which has brought him into far more prominence in literary history than his plays) was as theatre manager. He became, with Davenant, royal patentee, stage monopolist, and ex officio stage censor. Since Restoration stage history has been treated twice recently,[18] with Killigrew's place in it included in detail, only a few outstanding facts need be reviewed here. Apparently King Charles had given the dramatist hopes of royal favor in future theatrical enterprises during the Exile; he may even have appointed him a sort of provisional Master of the Revels. In 1654 Killigrew, speaking in the person of Thomaso, says:

> I promise thee Ferdinando [another character in the play], a Patent to shew him thy self; a favour, but that thou are a Friend to the Master of the Revels, you should not easily obtain, the shewing of your own Monster.[19]

Sir William Davenant, the Poet Laureate, had undeniable claims to favor in this direction also; and on

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 138–141.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 400; *Ibid.*, 1671, p. 216; 1676–77, p. 34.

[18] Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama 1660–1700*, Cambridge University Press, 1923; Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, Harvard University Press, 1928.

[19] *Thomaso or the Wanderer*, Part II, Act V, Scene 12. The play was in print before Killigrew actually became Master.

August 21, 1660, he and Killigrew received joint authorization to organize, house, and control companies of actors, to censor plays, and to enjoy a monopoly in London. The companies which had already sprung into being at the Red Bull, the Cock Pit, and Salisbury Court were suppressed after some difficulty, and a single troupe of actors organized from among them.[20] This company soon divided into two, governed independently by the two patentees: Killigrew's company became known as the King's Men; Davenant's as the Duke's Men. Davenant's articles of agreement with his company stipulated that the rival patentee was to have a free box at his theatre,[21] and it is rather obvious that Killigrew was the favored patentee, having first choice in everything—in patron, actors, and rights in plays. He was enabled to take the field in thoroughly organized form some time before Davenant, and his actors were the older and more experienced men. Mohun, Hart, Burt, and Lacy, whose names are too well known in theatrical history to require comment, were among his first group of actors, and the gifted young Kynaston soon left Davenant's company to join Killigrew's. Killigrew probably did not introduce women actors to the Restoration stage, but he gave stimulus and direction to the innovation. Among the six women who were soon regularly enrolled in his company were Mrs. Hughes, Mrs. Anne Marshall, and Mrs. Weaver. Other famous actors and actresses were added as time went on. It is interesting to observe that

[20] L. Hotson, pp. 204–6.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 207.

Killigrew's company furnished Nell Gwyn the stepping-stone from the streets of London to the precincts of Whitehall.[22]

The dramatist's theatrical ventures began at the Red Bull, whence he removed November 8, 1660, to Gibbons's Tennis Court, near Lincoln's Inn Fields, where plays were performed in a playhouse of a traditional Elizabethan type. On the 19th of this month the first performance at court after the Restoration took place, with a revival of Jonson's *The Silent Woman,* and although Davenant had the honor of writing a prologue, it was Killigrew's company which gave the play.[23] On May 7, 1663, the King's Men moved to the Theatre Royal between Bridges Street and Drury Lane, a new playhouse which had been built by Killigrew, his actors, and other investors. When this structure was designed, a permanent mark was made in theatre building, for the musicians were provided for with a pit before or under the stage.[24] The next few years were prosperous ones for Killigrew's company, although it is doubtful if the manager's takings ever amounted to as much in a single year as he was receiving from his annuity as groom of the bedchamber.[25] Financial difficulties began to be encountered, and in 1665 plague closed the theatres. Even after the reopening of the theatres, difficulties continued. The Restoration audience was small, and competition was bitter. Davenant and Killigrew had made separate peace with Sir Henry Her-

[22] A. Nicoll, p. 281.
[23] L. Hotson, p. 208.
[24] A. Nicoll, p. 61.
[25] L. Hotson, pp. 243–45.

bert and the lawsuits he had urged against their monopolies, but they were forced to combine to oust one George Jolly from the field as rival patentee. "Nurseries," or subsidiary playhouses in which plays were presented by young actors until they became proficient in their art, were a feature of the Restoration stage, and Jolly had received license to conduct one of these from the inconsistent King Charles.[26]

A stunning blow came in January, 1672, when the Theatre Royal burned down. After making shift to play in Lisle's Tennis Court, recently vacated by the Duke's Men, who had removed to their new playhouse in Dorset Garden (nearly four years after Davenant's death), the troupe rebuilt the Drury Lane theatre and returned to it in 1674. Killigrew's grip on the company was steadily loosening by this time. Building expenses had involved the financing of his enterprise tremendously. Hypothecation and re-hypothecation were forced upon him—transactions in which his creditor Richard Kent, his fellow bedchamberman Thomas Elliot, his wife's relatives the Sayers, and his son Charles, were all involved. There is no doubt that Killigrew's leading actors had had a share in the management of the company, especially in an artistic direction, from the first; but the dramatist had been the moving spirit, and one endowed with singularly auto-

[26] L. Hotson, pp. 176 *seq.* Mr. Hotson has inferred that Killigrew was chiefly responsible for a fraud practiced upon Jolly by the two monopolists, but Davenant and Killigrew were both rather ruthless. In fact Jolly himself during a strolling career on the continent had always proved venal in proportion to his opportunities, and it is difficult to feel much sympathy for him.

cratic powers. Now, as his financial embarrassments increased, the actor-sharers became more self-assertive, and his son Charles more importunate to receive the management of the company which had been promised him. On February 22, 1677, Killigrew was compelled (by pressure of law-suits) to turn the company over to his son, and three weeks later the Mastership of the Revels went the same way.[27]

The most recent and most detailed account of the Restoration stage features Davenant as the more eminent of the Restoration patentees. A rather black picture of the Theatre Royal is painted, and Killigrew is held responsible for its stormy career.[28] It is a question, however, whether these conclusions were not partly shaped by a preconception of the character of Killigrew. We must not underestimate the latter's importance. He was a theatrical manager for sixteen years to Davenant's eight. His company had preceded that of his rival in the field, and had consisted of pre-Commonwealth actors playing in a pre-Commonwealth type of theatre. The manager, like his rival, had received his theatrical experience in the days before the Civil Wars. Like Davenant Killigrew was an innovator. While it is impossible to apportion credit between the two patentees for their innovations, we know that Killigrew had shown an interest in scenes and machines in the theatre during the Interregnum,[29] that he promoted the custom of having women act, that he

[27] L. Hotson, p. 261.

[28] *Ibid.* Compare the comments upon Davenant, p. 223; and upon Killigrew, p. 242.

[29] See below, Chapter VII, p. 217.

took the lead in improving the music of the theatre.[30] It was at the Theatre Royal that Pepys had been when he said,

> . . . that which did please me beyond anything in the whole world was the wind musique when the angel [in the *Virgin Martyr*] comes down, which is so sweet that it ravished me.[31]

When we view Killigrew's theatre not too exclusively from its financial and legal side, we find that in spite of periodic lack of patronage and the increasing rivalry of the Duke's Company, it had a brilliant career. Besides a fair share in the plays of Shakespeare, Killigrew had exclusive rights to the cream of the plays of Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and James Shirley[32]—and he produced these plays constantly. Contemporary dramatists did not as a rule write exclusively for one company, but the plays of Wycherley, and Dryden (ultimately a sharer in the company) were usually presented at Drury Lane. Buckingham's refreshing *Rehearsal* was enacted by the King's Company while Killigrew still held the reins of management;[33] and during many a first night, the aging dramatist must have run an anxiously calculating eye over an audience which was about to witness a play now conspicuously placed in the annals of English dramatic literature. His was the royal theatre; and when the audience came, it was a brilliant one. When a play was wanted at court, Killigrew's company was most often chosen to present it—and, in good time, payment was made.[34]

[30] A. Nicoll, pp. 61–62.

[31] February 27, 1668.

[32] See the contemporary documents of allotment, A. Nicoll, pp. 314–16.

[33] A. Nicoll, pp. 348–76 ("Handlist of Restoration Plays").

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 305–11.

Killigrew's ideas of business management were unquestionably heterodox, but plague, fire, and meager Restoration audiences were afflictions which contributed so much to the practical distresses of the Theatre Royal that the manager's inefficiency would seem to have been overstressed in tracing the history of its decline.

Turning now to Killigrew's less public career, we find that although his own citizenship had been restored to him upon the arrival of the court in England, his Dutch wife and children were forced to wait upon the pleasure of Parliament for naturalization. In April, 1662, an act for naturalization of Charlotte and her three sons, Charles, Thomas, and Robert (whose names had already been included in an act of December, 1660) was passed by the Lords but dropped by the Commons.[35] Charlotte's sister, Katherine, had married another exiled Englishman, and her name and those of her three sons were included in the act. In April of the following year, the same act was passed by both Houses, and by June had been ratified by the King.[36] During the first few years of the Restoration the family of Thomas and Charlotte was further increased.[37] Either to accommodate his growing family, or simply as a real estate investment (since he had the privilege of living in the royal palace itself), Killigrew borrowed money of his

[35] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 49; *Cal. State Papers Domestic*, 1660–61, p. 413; *Historical MSS Commission*, Seventh Report, Appendix, Part I (1879), p. 164.

[36] *Lords Journals*, XI, 508, 534; *Commons Journals*, VIII, 468.

[37] A son, Roger, was born; and C. L. Chester, *op. cit.*, mentions two daughters. Col. Chester may have had access to entries in a parish register of which I am ignorant; in which case the daughters died young, for I have come upon no contemporary mention of them.

wife and erected two houses in Old Scotland Yard within the precincts of Whitehall, and the section was dignified with the name "Killigrew Court."[38] There is no doubt that the dramatist proceeded to live in style: he kept his coach, and his retiring place in the country.[39] Madame Killigrew was soon admitted to royal favor. In May, 1662, she was appointed Keeper of the Sweet Coffer for the Queen (Catherine), and in the following month she was sworn in to the important post of "first Lady of her Ma^ties^ Privy Chamber in ordinary."[40] She became ex officio "Lady" Killigrew, and received an annuity of approximately £300, the payments continuing after her husband's death.[41] Some indication of the varied services she rendered is furnished by an episode which occurred in March, 1663. Charlotte attempted to have certain packets of gimp lace, and gold and silver buttons smuggled in. The contraband was seized, but when it was deposed that the finery was intended to trim Her Majesty's petticoats, garters, and gloves, the customs officer was commanded to release it and content "himself with some small satisfaction."[42] Apparently King Charles sometimes waxed jovial with Madame Killigrew. On the occasion of the termination of hostilities with the Dutch

[38] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 44; Thomas's Will, P. C. C., 36 Drax; Wheatley and Cunningham, *op. cit.*, II, 335.

[39] *Pepys,* February 12, 1667; *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1672, p. 225. At Killigrew's Gardens at Isleworth the Dutch ambassadors were once entertained.

[40] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 45; *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1661–62, p. 385.

[41] *Cal. Treasury Papers* (and *Books*), *passim; Historical MSS Commission,* 14^th^ Report, Appendix, Part VI (1894), p. 169.

[42] *Cal. Treasury Papers,* 1660–67, p. 473.

in 1674 he bade her rather ungraciously to get drunk in celebration along with the rest of her countrymen.[43]

Thomas and Charlotte did not have a very peaceful domestic life. Because of the disparity in their estates at the time of their marriage, Thomas had been compelled to promise that whatever he should acquire from the favor of King Charles would be placed at the disposal of Charlotte and any children she might have.[44] The dramatist had levied upon his wife's portion of £10,000, and she in turn held a sort of lien upon his income, present and prospective. Her demands on behalf of herself and her children were perhaps fair enough, but Killigrew was constantly in need of money for his business projects and, probably, his personal extravagances. Moreover he had the rival claims of his son by his first wife to think of.[45] There is no need to enter in detail the subject of family bickering over money matters. There is no evidence that Killigrew seriously evaded his obligations to his children by his second wife. The careers of these children can only be suggested in this place. The eldest of them, Charles, was provided for with the promise of the managership of the Theatre Royal and the office of Master of the Revels. Charles did not suffer the promise to be an idle one, and practically wrested both offices from his father before the latter's death. He became a courtier, a man-about-town, a friend of Dryden, and, in

[43] "Williamson's Letters," *Camden Soc. Publications* (1874), II, 158.

[44] Cf. "Madam Killigrew's Case," British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 44.

[45] For one instance in which Henry was in conflict with his stepmother see *Cal. Treasury Books,* 1681–85, p. 758.

spite of apparent literary interests, a very unsuccessful theatre manager.[46] The next son, Robert, was provided with a position as page in court.[47] He entered the army and rose to the rank of major in the royal regiment of dragoons.[48] He was sent on foreign services, and died a brigadier-general at the Battle of Almanzor April 14, 1707; a monument was erected to his memory in Westminster Abbey.[49] Thomas, the third son born abroad, was provided by his father with a part interest in the reversion of the office of water-bailiff of the Thames, and was sent to New College, Oxford. His career cannot be very fully reconstructed, but it is certain that he died June 3, 1674.[50] He was not, therefore, Thomas Killigrew the Younger, author of the comedy *Chit-Chat* (1719). Thomas Killigrew the Younger has been confused with Thomas Killigrew, Junior, by the *Dictionary of National Biography* and many other works; the younger dramatist was probably a grandson or grandnephew of our Killigrew, although I have been unable to discover the degree of relationship.[51] Roger Killigrew, Thomas's fourth son

[46] L. Hotson, *op. cit., passim; D. N. B.,* XXXI, 107; Boase and Courtney, *op. cit.,* pp. 287, 1754–55; N. Luttrel, *Brief Historical Relation,* 6 vols., Oxford, 1857, III, 24.

[47] *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1671, p. 583.

[48] *Ibid.,* 1694–95, p. 28.

[49] E. W. Bragley, *History and Antiquities of Westminster Abbey,* London, 1823, II, 227.

[50] *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1666–67, p. 187; A. Clark, *Life and Times of Anthony Wood,* Oxford, 1900, II, 287; Boase and Courtney, *op. cit.,* p. 1259.

[51] There was a Thomas Killigrew, an army officer, active about 1688–96 (cf. *Historical MSS Commission,* Laing MSS, Vol. I (1914), p. 460; *Ibid.,* 14th Report, Appendix, Part IV (1894), p. 404), but the author of *Chit-Chat* was probably a young man in 1719.

by Charlotte, must have been born shortly after the Restoration, although we have no mention of him until 1675, when his father listed him among his surviving children.[52] He became water-bailiff of the Thames, and died a short time prior to July, 1694.[53] No records remain of any daughters in the Killigrew family, if indeed there ever were any.

There is an abundance of evidence, all of one sort, concerning Killigrew's son by his first wife, Cecilia.[54] It would be difficult to point to a worse rogue than Henry Killigrew among all the rakes and scoundrels who afflicted the Restoration court. He was twenty-three years old in 1660, and became one of the dissolute companions of the young Earl of Rochester. In the years that followed, his licentiousness was such as to evoke rumors among his contemporaries of acts which were nothing short of criminal. On one occasion Buckingham administered him a beating in public; on another, Lady Shrewsbury (who had been his mistress, as well as Buckingham's) had him attacked and nearly killed on the highway. King Charles banished him several times—once when he had used abusive language to Nell Gwyn. Pepys, who mentions Henry a number of times (always with horror), found his mad

[52] *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1675–76, p. 314.

[53] *Ibid.,* 1694–95, p. 234.

[54] *Pepys Diary, passim; Grammont's Memoirs of the Court of Charles II, passim;* Boase and Courtney, *op. cit.,* pp. 288, 1255. See also contemporary correspondence: *Historical MSS Commission,* 7th Report, Part I (1879), pp. 468, 485–86; 12th Report, Part V (1889), pp. 38, 43, 146, 150; Part VII (1890), pp. 51, 52; *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1664–65, pp. 57, 313; A. Clark, *op. cit.,* III, 472. In this letter to Anthony à Wood, dated 1694, Henry is named as the King's jester with a salary of £300 a year.

discourse sufficient to make his "heart ake"; and the opinion that he was a liar and a blackguard seems to have been nearly universal. Yet he was a great "Wit," succeeded to his father's court employments, and continued in favor in the reign of James and even of William and Mary. Perhaps he subsided somewhat as he grew older. While it has been deemed unnecessary to trace the career of Henry into all of its purlieus, it is essential that we be aware of that career for certain definite reasons. Since there have come down to us such full records of Henry's scandalous life, we are in a position to realize the significance of the absence of such records concerning the life of his father. If Thomas Killigrew had been the man he is supposed to have been, we should have contemporary evidence of the fact. The truth is that a process of amalgamation has taken place and Thomas has constantly been confused with his son.

The escapades of young Killigrew figure largely in the *Memoirs of Count Grammant*. Anthony Hamilton, the author of this widely read work, refers only to "Killigrew" (whom incidentally he calls a "man of honor") and most of his readers and editors have assumed that he referred to Thomas. Recent editors have shown a growing consciousness that there was more than one Killigrew living at the Restoration, but the damage had been done and this one book has probably been the chief factor in the process of visiting the sins of the son upon the father. The old saying about giving a dog a bad name has never had its truth better illustrated than by the fate of Thomas Killigrew with

posterity. Any evil spoken of him has been believed and repeated. Jesse went to the extent of saying "Killigrew was in fact in the pay of Cromwell, and an unprincipled spy upon the actions of his benefactor," and this absurd charge was given partial credence by so noteworthy a scholar as Dr. Doran.[55] Of course all popular books on court rakes and jesters (and there have been many in which the dramatist has figured) have attached to Thomas any bit of scandal ever told of a Killigrew. But the confusion of Thomas with Henry has not been limited to such works. Masson's *Life of Milton* confuses the two six times, and the error persists in one instance even in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Scholars have continually suffered their interpretation of Killigrew's life and works to be colored by unconscious prejudice. One illustration of this process will suffice. On July 6, 1668, Pepys wrote:

> With Sir W. Coventry; and we walked in the park together a good while. He mighty kind to me; and hear many pretty stories of my Lord Chancellor's being here to fore made sport of by Peter Talbot the priest, in his story of the death of Cardinal Bleau; by Lord Cottington, in his Dolor de las Tripas; and Tom Killigrew, in his being bred in Ram-ally, and now bound prentice to Lord Cottington going to Spain with £1000 and two suits of clothes.

In other words Coventry had repeated stories about Hyde which had been told by Talbot, Cottington, and Hyde's old enemy, Killigrew. But in a recent work the entry has been extracted thus:

[55] J. H. Jesse, *Memoirs of the Court of England during the Reign of the Stuarts*, 4 vols., London, 1840, IV, 275; J. Doran, *History of Court Fools*, London, 1858, p. 221. Dr. Doran tends to qualify the remark somewhat.

Hear many pretty stories of . . . Tom Killigrew, in his being bred in Ram-ally.[56]

Of course it was Hyde who had been sent to Spain, and the allusion to "Ram-ally" is not such a sinister one, probably being no more than a slur upon the Chancellor's training as a lawyer, Ram-alley having been one of the meaner avenues into the Temple from Fleet Street.

We must attempt to arrive at an estimate of Killigrew's character from contemporary references. It is true that he was attacked in his own day; but very few figures of any prominence at this time remained unmolested by satirists, and Killigrew's position as court favorite and theatrical monopolist was such as to win him enemies. The attacks upon him are not very numerous or devastating. About 1664 Hollar's caricature of the dramatist was copied by Bosse and was furnished with a new set of satirical verses in French.[57] The charges are not very definite, Killigrew being simply "fourré de malice," "chargé de maux," etc. Another satire was published in 1667 by Richard Flecknoe, *The Life of Tomaso the Wanderer.*[58] Flecknoe describes in

[56] H. McAfee, *Pepys on the Restoration Stage,* New Haven, 1916, p. 270. This is not characteristic of this very useful book.

[57] *Catalogue of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum,* London, 1870, I, 571–72. The original as well as the copy is here dated 1664, evidently an error. J. P. Malcolm, *Historical Sketch of the Art of Caricaturing,* 1813, p. 28, gives an outline of the original and dates it 1641. *The Catalogue of Thomason Tracts,* London, 1908, I, 98, dates the original March, 1642, and this is probably correct. G. Thorn-Drury (see note 58) has furnished an excellent reproduction of the early engraving.

[58] The pamphlet, printed for the author, exists in a copy which is probably unique. It was discovered and handsomely reprinted by G. Thorn-Drury, London, 1925. In his prefatory note Thorn-Drury speaks of Killi-

scathing but rather general terms the character of the dramatist, accusing him of too many moral and physical deformities to be convincing. The cause of Flecknoe's rancor is not far to seek: Killigrew had not proved anxious to produce his plays.[59] After all, even though Flecknoe may not have been so prodigiously dull as Dryden has painted him, refusal to produce his plays can not be considered in anyone a major crime.

Other contemporaries of Killigrew are far more friendly. Edward Phillips, nephew of Milton, merely speaks of "the general esteem of his lepid vein of wit in conversation," but Anthony à Wood, and Gerard Langbaine mention him in terms of warm commendation—writing, too, after his death, when nothing could be hoped or feared from him.[60] Killigrew enjoyed authority, and a number of the documents from which his public career has been reconstructed indicate that his contemporaries recognized him as a person to be respected. On one occasion Sir Robert Howard, who had got into some trouble concerning the actress, Mrs. Weaver, expressed his regrets that his case could not have been heard "before the King or Mr. Killigrew had been in the way."[61] Samuel Pepys, our best informant,

grew's "marked preference for obscenity in plays," a remark not borne out by the facts. Killigrew did cast his *Parson's Wedding* entirely with women, a disgraceful thing to do, but obscenity (in which the Theatre Royal did *not* specialize) marked certain productions of both playhouses and must be charged to Restoration audiences rather than to the theatre managers.

[59] See G. Thorn-Drury's preface; and C. Cibber, and other hands, *Lives of the Poets*, 5 vols., London, 1753, II, 61.

[60] E. Phillips, *Theatrum Poetarum Anglicanorum* (1675), Geneva (3rd Edition), 1824, p. 43. A. à Wood, see below, p. 139; G. Langbaine, see Chap. VI, p. 221n.

[61] *Cal. State Papers Domestic*, 1664–65, p. 139.

speaks of Killigrew in terms of respect, in spite of the fact that he did not care for his plays. Several times the two "fell in talk . . . about musick," and the diarist frequently found it worthwhile to record the dramatist's presence at a function. Pepys found Killigrew an entertaining companion. He went to Sir Thomas Teddiman's funeral—"But, Lord! to see among the company the young commanders, and Thomas Killigrew and others that came, how unlike a burial this was."[62] Considering the intimacy and the gossipy nature of the *Diary*, it is significant that scandal concerning Killigrew does not appear. Pepys has given us the opportunity to spend an evening with the dramatist and we may take advantage of it. On February 12, 1667, he wrote:

With my Lord Brouncker [President of the Royal Society] by coach to his house, there to hear some Italian musique: and here we met Tom Killigrew, Sir Robert Murray, and the Italian Signor Baptista [Giovanni Baptista Draghi, composer in the service of Queen Catherine], who hath proposed a play in Italian for the Opera, which T. Killigrew do intend to have up; and here he did sing one of the acts . . . I am not so much smitten with it as it may be I should be if I were acquainted with their accent. But the whole composition is certainly most excellent; and the poetry, T. Killigrew and Sir R. Murray, who understood the words did say most excellent. . . . This done T. Killigrew and I do talk: and he tells me how the audience at his house is not above half as much as it used to be before the late fire. That Knipp is like to make the best actor that ever came upon the stage, she understanding so well: that they are going to give her £30 a year more. That the stage is now by his pains a thousand times better and more glorious than ever heretofore. Now wax-candles, and many

[62] May 15, 1668.

of them; then not above 3 lbs. of tallow: now all things civil, no rudeness anywhere, then, as in a bear-garden: then two or three fiddlers, now nine or ten of the best: then nothing but rushes upon the ground, and everything else mean; now all otherwise: then the Queene seldom and the King never would come; now, not the King only for state, but all civil people do think they may come as well as any. He tells me that he has gone several times (eight or ten times, he tells me) hence to Rome, to hear good musique; so much he loves it, though he never did sing or play a note. That he hath ever endeavoured in the late King's time and in this to introduce good musique, but he never could do it, there never having been any musique here better than ballads. And says "Hermitt poore" and "Chiny Chese" was all the musique we had; and yet no ordinary fiddlers get so much money as ours do here, which speaks our rudeness still. That he hath gathered our Italians from several courts in Christendome to come to make a concert for the King, which he do give £200 a-year a-piece to, but poorly paid, and do come in the room of keeping four ridiculous Gundilows, he having got the King to put them away, and lay out money this way. And indeed I do commend him for it; for I think it is a very noble undertaking. He do intend to have some time this year three operas performed at the two present theatres, since he is defeated in what he intended in Moorefields in purpose for it. And he tells me plainly that the city audience was as good as the Court; but now they are most gone. . . . Having done our discourse, we all took coaches (my Lord's and T. Killigrew's) and to Mrs. Knipp's chamber, where this Italian is to teach her to sing her part. And so we all thither, and there she did sing an Italian song or two very fine . . . and exceeding taken I am with her singing, and believe she will do miracles at that and acting.

The impression one gets from this of Thomas Killigrew as raw-edged, talkative, boastful to the point of prevarication, but certainly respectable, is probably an adequate one. He was nearly fifty in the year of the

Restoration, and was a generation removed from Charles Stuart and the typical Restoration roué. Ugly stories, such as attached to courtiers like William Chaffinch, were not circulated about Killigrew during his own day. Had the old dramatist lived scandalously, we should be able to prove the fact. Nothing has been suppressed in this review of his life, except, in the name of good taste, one ribald remark he made to Pepys. It is understood, however, that no claim is made that he was incapable of a ribald remark; his comedies are sufficient testimony of his capacity in this direction. But those who have ever dipped into the so-called *State Poems,* or have read the minor works of certain highly esteemed seventeenth-century authors, will recognize how general a disease, even among the most fashionable and most gifted, looseness of language was in Killigrew's day.

In his own times Killigrew was known chiefly for his wit. This wit was apparently of the caustic variety, for the dramatist seems to have been one of those benighted persons who "speak their minds." Still, Charles I relished it, and contemporaries spoke of Killigrew as the King's "Jester." On February 12, 1678, Pepys wrote in his Diary:

> Mr. Brisband tells me in discourse that Tom Killigrew hath a fee out of the Wardrobe for cap and bells, under the title of King's Foole or Jester; and may revile or jeere anybody, the greatest persons, without offense, by the privilege of his place.

Pepys seems to have taken as literal truth a story probably promulgated by someone who had felt the rough edge of Killigrew's tongue. Others, since Pepys, have

taken Mr. Brisband's report seriously. A moment's reflection will explain why there has been found no official reference to Killigrew's "cap and bells." Queen Elizabeth had had her fools in motley, and the line had been continued through Archy Armstrong and Muckle John down until the time of Charles I.[63] But the court of Charles II was more sophisticated. Clowning had become the province of peers, and "the old Elizabeth way" of providing amusement would have been considered more ridiculous than the four fiddling "gundilows" whom Killigrew succeeded in removing from the court. Killigrew was literally the King's "jester": that is, he amused his master with his jests; there is a distinction between this and being a court fool. In 1616 no less a person than the father of the future Earl of St. Albans was referred to just as Killigrew has been.[64] We must remember that liveried clowns such as Archy Armstrong could neither read nor write, and were usually feeble-minded; and that Killigrew was a gentleman. The usages of this past age were different from our own, but we must not think it capable of equipping with cap and bells the same person who was sent as ambassador to foreign nations, appointed groom of the bedchamber, given the governance of the royal theatre, and was finally buried in Westminster Abbey.

Of the sallies and retorts variously attributed to Killigrew, the wittiest has the authority of William Hals.[65] The dramatist is said to have been accompany-

[63] *Gentlemen's Magazine*, CIII, Part I (1833), p. 27.

[64] J. Doran, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

[65] Hals lived from 1655 until 1737, but his *Parochial History* was not printed until 1750: cf. Chap. I, note 1.

ing Louis XIV through the royal picture galleries in Paris, when they came upon a painting of Christ placed between portraits of the Pope and of Louis himself. Killigrew remarked that he had always heard that the Saviour had been "hung" between two thieves, but until that moment he had not suspected who they were. Unfortunately the story is probably as apocryphal as a host of others accumulating about Killigrew's name during the eighteenth century.[66] The few authentic examples we have of Killigrew's wit are not especially hilarious, but taste in repartee changes. Pepys tells that on one occasion when King Charles called his brother, the Duke of York, a "Tom Otter" (the husband in Jonson's *Epicœne, or The Silent Woman*), Killigrew rejoined, "Sir, Pray which is the best for a man, to be a Tom Otter to his wife or his mistress?"[67] On another occasion Pepys heard "as a great truth" that Killigrew had admonished the King on the ill state of his affairs, and said:

"There is a good honest able man, that I could name, that if your Majesty would employ, and command to see all things well

[66] Just as George Peele's name had been attached to series of jests after the old dramatist's death, so Killigrew's name was used during the eighteenth century. A few examples are *England's Remembrancer,* 1750 (*Cat. of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum,* Vol. III, Pt. II, p. 1041); *Killigrew's Jests, or a Pocket Companion for the Wits,* by Ferdinando Killigrew, pseud., 1764 (*Notes and Queries,* Eighth Series, VI, 347); *The Merry Quack Doctor, or the Fun Box broke open . . . by Tom Killigrew Junior, President of the Wits Club, in Picadilly, and Great Grandson to the Famous Killigrew, Jester to King Charles the Second of Merry Memory,* pseud. (?), 12°, 1769. Killigrew has also figured as a character in literature: cf. *Dialogues of the Living and the Dead,* 1702 (*Term Catalogues,* III, 288); *Twenty-ninth of May, Rare Doings at the Restoration,* by Ephraim Hardcastle, pseud., W. H. Pryne, 1825 (*Boase and Courtney, op. cit.,* p. 294). This is an historical novel in which Killigrew appears.

[67] July 30, 1667.

executed, all things would soon be mended, and this is one Charles Stuart, who now spends his time in employing his lips about the Court, and hath no other employment; but if you would give him this employment, he were the fittest man in the world to perform it.[68]

Pepys goes on to say that the King profited not at all by this but returned to his pleasures, "Which is a sorrowful consideration." Practically all of Killigrew's sayings which have any claim to authenticity have, curiously enough, this moralizing cast.

Not everyone was so good humored as King Charles under Killigrew's rebukes. On February 17, 1667, Pepys recorded in his Diary that "that worthy fellow," the Earl of Rochester, had been offended by Killigrew's raillery and had struck the old dramatist, in the presence of the King. The Earl was in his cups, but the court was offended that Charles should suffer this indignity in his presence, and forgive it. "How Tom Killigrew takes it," says Pepys, "I do not hear." There was only one way to take it. Killigrew was approaching sixty at this time, and Rochester was a mere youth, but he was inviolate. The very next month Sir William Coventry was to be dismissed from the King's council and sent to the tower for challenging the Duke of Buckingham.[69] We learn from a contemporary letter that Rochester, about to depart for France, "did solemnly ask pardon of Harry Killigrew for the affront he offered his father."[70]

[68] December 8, 1666.

[69] *Pepys Diary,* March 6, 1669. Buckingham had attacked Coventry in a skit at the Theatre Royal. Coventry's threat to punish the actors has usually been misunderstood as a threat to punish Thomas Killigrew.

[70] *Historical MSS Commission,* 7th Report, Appendix, Part I (1879), p. 531.

We must not think of Killigrew's star as in the descendent at the time of Rochester's blow. For several more years he remained active as a theatre manager, courtier, and man of affairs. Toward the end of his life, however, he suffered from ill health, his financial affairs became increasingly troublesome, and no doubt his wit flashed with decreasing frequency. Things were not always well with him. In August, 1674, King Charles required certain "Loyal Indigent Officers" wishing a patent for holding lotteries to receive permission of Killigrew, such lotteries being his perquisite as Master of the Revels. The petitioners represented a worthy cause, and Killigrew signified his consent that they have their patent. The following year, his own request was granted, that after fourteen years (by which time it may be inferred that the war veterans would be free from earthly needs) the control of lotteries come into his hands for the benefit of himself, his wife, and his three sons: Charles, Robert and Roger. The grant was to be for forty-one years, and Killigrew made it clear, "as he was old and infirm and not likely to reap much benefit for himself" from the reversion, that the provision was chiefly for his heirs.[71] We have already seen that in 1677 the Theatre Royal passed out of the dramatist's hands. During the succeeding years his name appears less and less frequently in the Treasury Books, although quarterly payments on his pension were occasionally made. King Charles showed less facility in forgetting his old servant than would be expected of him: in 1680 he made him a grant of £231 and recom-

[71] *Cal. State Papers Domestic,* 1673–75, p. 332; 1675–76, Index.

mended that arrears of £850 on his pension be paid.[72] There is no reason to say that Killigrew was in poverty in his last years, although arrears in his pension continued to pile up and, at the end, he had very little to leave behind.

On March 15, 1683, he made his will. His only estate consisted of the two houses in Scotland Yard, the income on which—except for an annuity of £20 settled upon an old servant—he left to his son, Henry, with the reversion to a grandson, James. Henry, who was, after all, his father's legal heir, also received the dubious legacy of the arrears on all pensions. His wife, Charlotte, and his other children, Thomas does not mention in the will at all. Reasons for this have already been touched upon. Another reason is indicated in the will itself, which reads in part:

> My body I leave to be returned to the earth & to be decently buryed as near as conveniently may be in the vault in Westminster Abbey where my dear deceased wife and my sister Shannon doe lye interred.[73]

We must give Killigrew credit for enduring attachments, for his brief period of married life with Cecilia had ended over forty years before.

Four days after making his will, on March 19, 1683, Thomas Killigrew died within the precincts of White-

[72] *Cal. Treasury Books*, 1679–80, *passim; Cal. State Papers Domestic*, 1680–81, p. 90.

[73] Thomas Killigrew's will Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 36 Drax. Henry Killigrew, the son, was sole executor, and William Killigrew, the older brother, was witness. Charlotte was a claimant to the Scotland Yard property (British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 44) and seems to have succeeded in establishing her claim (*Ibid.*, 5751, f. 32). She lived until her 87th year, letters of administration to her estate being granted May 15, 1716 (*D. N. B.*, XXXI, 115).

hall; he was seventy-one years of age. King Charles contributed £50 toward the funeral expenses of his old servant,[74] and the body was laid in Westminster Abbey by the side of Ben Jonson.[75] Anthony à Wood, who has supplied the precise date of Killigrew's death, remarks that he

> . . . was much respected by all for the generosity and good acts he did for several poor cavaliers, that had in a woeful manner suffered for his Majesty's cause.

But he adds,

> It was usually said of this noted person that when he took a pen in hand, it did not answer to the never-failing smartness he showed in conversation, upon which account Sir John Denham, a shrewd and severe judge, and a familiar acquaintance with him and Abr. Cowley, passed this censure upon their abilities and defects.
>
> Had Cowley ne'er spoke, Killigrew ne'er writ,
> Combin'd in one, they'd made a matchless wit.[76]

Like most antitheses, Denham's couplet does not quite do justice to the truth. Wittier things may be found in Killigrew's comedies than in any report of his conversation. One may add that more decency may be found in the course of his life than parts of his comedies would lead us to expect—a great deal more, certainly, than is implied by the myth which time has woven about his name.

It is unnecessary to continue, and to trace the decline

[74] "Moneys for Secret Services of Charles II and James II," J. Ackerman, Ed., *Camden Soc. Publications* (1851), p. 70.

[75] Wheatley and Cunningham, *op. cit.*, III, 473.

[76] Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses,* IV, 692.

of the Killigrews.[77] When Thomas died, his two brothers, four of his sons, and a number of grandsons, nephews, and grandnephews were living. The older branch of the Killigrew family at Arwenack still had a male heir. At the time of the Revolution, in spite of the long Protestant tradition in the family, a number of Killigrews espoused the cause of their patron Stuarts. In the early years of the eighteenth century, a blight seems to have struck the family in all its branches, and the line died out via a number of impecunious army officers. In 1738 Martin Killigrew, who had married into the older branch of the family and taken his wife's surname, wrote the swan song of the Arwenack family, and remarked that two grandsons and a great-grandson of Thomas were the last of the Killigrews then living, "to whom," he said, "I am a stranger or desire to be so thought." These grandsons, apparently the offspring of Charles Killigrew who had died in 1725 (twenty years after his half-brother, Henry), died in 1751 and 1757. The great-grandson, Thomas Guilford Killigrew (perhaps illegitimate) was the last traceable descendant to bear the five-hundred-year-old name: he died in 1782, an impoverished Bristol taverner.

[77] This sketch, which does not pretend to completeness, is based upon Martin Killigrew's allusions to the younger branch of the family (see above, Chap. I, note 1); the death notice in the *Gentleman's Magazine;* and *Notes and Queries,* Fourth Series, XI, 224; *Ibid.,* Eighth Series, X, 134; XI, 31, 50. The name "Killigrew" is extinct in England, but Killigrews are reported living in Boston, Massachusetts, at the present time (C. W. Bardsley, *Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames,* 1901, p. 450), and it may very well be that a branch of the family settled in Ireland toward the end of the seventeenth century and thence emigrated to America.

V

AMATEUR PLAYS

IN the decade preceding the closing of the theatres it became more and more the custom of gentlemen to dabble in the art of writing plays; and the wane of the great period of English dramatic activity was marked, like its beginning, by a number of productions which can be designated only as amateur experiments. Thomas Killigrew's first three plays, *The Prisoners, Claricilla,* and *The Princess,* are distinctly amateur plays, written by a young courtier under twenty-five years of age whose more serious interests in life lay elsewhere than in the theatre. We must recognize, however, that a man of Killigrew's years and of his peculiar situation in life would be less likely to dash off plays as mere courtly exercises, than to write them with calculation, as means of winning a name in those elegant circles to which he clung. We might predicate a desire on his part to be an innovator, and a study of his early plays reveals the fact that he actually harbored such a desire. His early plays, while not his best, are his most interesting ones to students of seventeenth-century drama.

The three plays, all tragi-comedies, were written within a single, brief period, and they are so similar in theme and treatment that they must be discussed collectively. As preface to this discussion, the relatively

simple matter of the publication of Killigrew's plays may be disposed of. The Stationers' Register declares that on April 2, 1640, Master Crooke "Entered for his Copies under the hands of doctor wykes and Master ffetherston warden a Comedy called The Swaggering Damosell by Master Chamberleyne. And a Tragedy called The Prisoner by Master Killegrey." On August 4, 1640, a similar entry was made of "a play called Claracilla by Master Killegray."[1] In the following year the plays appeared in print:

The/PRISONERS/and/CLARACILLA./Two Tragae-Comedies./ As they were presented at the/*Phoenix* in *Drury-Lane,* by her/ Mties Servants./Written by *Tho. Killigrew,* Gent./London/ Printed by *T Cotes,* for *Andrew Crooke,*/and are to be sold at his shop, at the/signe of the Greene *Dragon* in *Pauls*/Church-yard. 1641.

The volume is a duodecimo, roughly printed and with pages unnumbered. There are additional title pages for the separate plays, that for *The Prisoners* bearing the date 1640. The commendatory verse prefixed to the plays has already been alluded to.[2] No subsequent edition of these plays, and no edition at all of their companion play, *The Princess,* appeared until the publication of the folio. On October 24, 1663, Master Henry Herringman "Entred for his Copie under the hands of Sr Jon Berkenhead and Master Luke Fawne warden a booke or coppie conteyning nine plays in one

[1] E. Arber, *Transcript of the Stationers' Register,* London, 1875–94, IV, 504, 517.

[2] See Chap. II, note 8. The duodecimo is now a rather rare book. The present writer has used a copy in the library of the University of Pennsylvania.

volume, (viz') 1 The Princess, a Tragi-Comedy, the scene Naples. 2 The Parsons Wedding, a Comedy, the scene London. 3 The Pilgrim a tragedy, the scene Millan, 4 & 5 Cicillia & Clorinda, or Love in Armes, A Tragi-Comedy written in 2 parts, the scene Lombardy. 6 & 7 Thomaso, or the Wanderer, a Comedy written in 2 parts, The Scene Madrid, 8 Bellamira her dreame, or the Love of Shadows, 9 A Tragi-comedy written in 2 parts, the scene Naples. By Thomas Killigrew."[3] In 1664 the plays appeared in a rich folio:

COMEDIES,/and/TRAGEDIES./written by/THOMAS KILLIGREW,/Page of Honour to King *Charles* the First./and/Groom of the Bed-Chamber to King/*Charles* the Second./London./Printed for *Henry Herringman,* at the Sign of the *Anchor* in/the Lower Walk of the *New Exchange.* 1664.

Apparently the original design had been to collect in the folio only those plays entered in the Stationers' Register as not previously published. Separate title pages occur for each play and all bear the date 1663 except *The Prisoners* and *Claricilla.* These seem to have been added to the collection as an afterthought, perhaps in order to swell the size of the volume, for they are separately paginated and their title pages bear the date of the collection as a whole, 1664. The text of these reprinted plays follows that of the duodecimo except that there are instances of revision throughout. The spelling too is modernized; the name of the heroine in the one play is altered from Claracilla to Claricilla; and whereas the plays had originally been printed as

[3] Eyre and Rivington, *Transcript of the Stationers' Register,* 1640–1708, London, 1913, II, 331.

blank verse, they are reprinted as prose. There is no doubt that Killigrew collected his works as a gesture, and supervised the preparation of the folio. In place of the old-fashioned commendatory verse at the beginning, there is an author's epistle:

To the Reader,

I shall only say, If you have as much leasure to Read as I had to write these Plays, you may, as I did, find a diversion; though I wish it you upon better terms than Twenty Years Banishment.

Yours,

Tho. Killigrew.

The author seems to have sat for his portrait especially that it might be reproduced as a frontispiece to the folio. Faithorne's picture, portraying the dramatist at work on his plays, is one of the most famous portrait-engravings of the seventeenth century. It is a sad commentary that the folio, of which there are a number of copies extant, is a valuable book chiefly because of the frontispiece.

On the title page of each play in the folio, the author has placed the name of a dedicatee (usually a lady selected from among his more fashionable kinsmen or acquaintances),[4] and has stated where the play was written. This second item of information furnishes our chief means of dating the separate works. Returning now to those plays which are properly the subject

[4] The three plays considered in this chapter are all dedicated to relatives —to his "Dear Nieces," Lady Crompton and Lady Anne Wentworth, and to his "Dear Sister," Lady Shannon. Lady Shannon was his sister, Elizabeth Boyle, several times mentioned above. Anne Wentworth, wife of Lord Lovelace, was actually the niece of Killigrew's first wife, Cecilia Crofts. Lady Crompton was also probably a relative by marriage.

of this chapter, we learn from the title pages that *Claricilla* was written in Rome, and *The Princess* was written in Naples. Since both plays were on the stage before the closing of the theatres, and since Killigrew had been in southern Italy only once up until 1642, these plays must have been written in the winter and early spring of 1636.[5] The title of the third play in this group, *The Prisoners,* informs us that this play was written in London. Since it was printed in 1640, we have one limit for the date of composition. We can infer that it was an older play than the other two, not only because it was free to be placed in the hands of the printer four months before *Claricilla,* but because there is evidence in the play itself that mark it as the first attempt. It was written in London, then, before, rather than after, Killigrew's departure for Italy in October, 1635, and the year 1635 itself is suggested as the most probable date of composition. Killigrew was a very young man and would not have begun writing much before this; moreover his first three plays are so similar in theme and treatment that they impress one as having followed each other in rapid succession. With as near a feeling of certainty as is possible in such matters we may say that *The Prisoners, Claricilla,* and *The Princess* were written in that order in 1635–36 probably within a period of less than twelve months.

The period at which Killigrew wrote his early plays is an interesting one in the history of English drama because it has been pointed to so frequently as a time of

[5] For the date of the trip to Italy see above, Chap. II, p. 60; for the stage history of the plays see below, pp. 172–74.

cleavage, when plays appeared which are just as prophetic of the heroic plays of Orrery, Howard, Dryden, and the later Davenant as they are reminiscent of the tragi-comedy of Beaumont and Fletcher with their successors in the school of Shirley. It has, however, proven so difficult to point to any single drama which could be maintained in all respects the predecessor of the Restoration type that a number of scholars have preferred to select an example of that type fully equipped with heroic couplets and with a discernible source in the fiction of La Calprenède or Scudéry, and to imply that it was a new thing, created by special fiat as the result of the exiled cavaliers' reading French literature in Paris and of the restored Charles II's introducing into England a Frenchified court.[6] It is scarcely necessary to insist in this place that the heroic couplet is not the desideratum of the Restoration heroic play. When one turns to the more essential characteristics of the heroic plays, their story material, their type of character, and their general atmosphere, he finds it difficult

[6] Differences of opinion concerning the origins of the heroic play can not be reviewed very well in this place. The reader is referred to the chapter "Decadent Romance" in F. E. Schelling, *Elizabethan Drama, 1558–1642,* II, 307–70, Boston and New York, 1908; C. G. Child, "The Rise of the Heroic Play," *Modern Language Notes,* XIX (1904), 166–173; J. W. Tupper, Introduction to the *Belles-Lettres Series* edition of Davenant, Boston, 1909; L. N. Chase, *The English Heroic Play,* Columbia Dissertation, 1903; F. H. Ristine, *English Tragicomedy,* Columbia Dissertation, 1910 (Chap. V); A. Nicoll, *Restoration Drama 1660–1700,* Cambridge University Press, 1923, pp. 90–121. Since this book has been in press, a new article has appeared on the subject: Kathleen Lynch, "Conventions of Platonic Drama in the Heroic Plays of Orrery and Dryden," *P. M. L. A.,* June, 1929, pp. 456–471. In this interesting contribution, Miss Lynch demonstrates that the heroic play owed many conventions to earlier English drama.

to accept *The Siege of Rhodes, Mustapha, The Indian Queen,* or any of their group as the first of a new species. Those who have refused to do so have instanced such pre-Commonwealth plays as Davenant's *Love and Honor* (1634) and *The Fair Favorite* (1638), Carlell's *Arviragus and Philicia* (1636) and *The Passionate Lovers* (1636), and Cartwright's *Royal Slave* (1636)—all of which contain in greater or less degree "heroic" atmosphere, characterization, and story material. Killigrew's early plays belong precisely to the period of these mentioned, and they provide an even stronger link than the others between the heroic plays of the Restoration and earlier tragi-comedy.

Those who have taken the modified view that the heroic play of the Restoration was a new thing only in so far as it was affected by a new tide of French influence arising out of the heroic romances of La Calprenède and Scudéry (which came too late to have affected the plays of the earlier writers)[7] have failed to give sufficient weight to the fact that La Calprenède and Scudéry, while its chief exponents, were not the originators of the heroic romance in France. La Calprenède and Scudéry had predecessors in creating a type of fiction, and Orrery and Dryden had predecessors in adapting this type of fiction in English drama. Reference is not made here to those pastoral and allegori-

[7] This is the position taken by a more recent writer on the subject, W. S. Clark, "The Sources of the Restoration Heroic Play," *Review of English Studies,* IV (1928), 49–63. The influence of two of La Calprenède's romances on Restoration heroic plays has been treated at length in a Chicago Dissertation: cf. H. W. Hill, *La Calprenède's Romances and The Restoration Drama,* Reprinted from *University of Nevada Studies,* Vol. II (1910), No. 3, and Vol. III (1911), No. 2.

cal fictions of de Molière, Gombauld, and Camus, which perhaps are more nearly akin to the *Astrée* than to *Cléopâtra* or *le Grand Cyrus;* but to the pseudo-historical heroic romances of Marin le Roy Sieur de Gomberville and Armand Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin. To the type of romance written by these two men their successors added practically nothing.[8] The fact is that a heroic romance had actually been translated into English before La Calprenède, Scudéry or Vaumorière had begun to write.[9] Gomberville's *Polexandre* and Saint-Sorlin's *Ariane* had been printed in a definitive form in French by 1632, and they would have been read almost as quickly, and have been enjoyed as much, in England as in France. The *Astrée* of D'Urfé had quickly penetrated to England and had had sufficient vogue in the circle of Queen Henrietta Maria to have created a distinct group of English *précieuses;*[10] and Killigrew himself was among the English lesser Molières who found food for satire among "platonick" ladies.[11] English drama had been sensitive from the very beginning to foreign influences, and it did not wait upon this occasion for a political upheaval, an exile and a restoration, to make use of French material. Predisposed to innovation because of his youth and his minor position at court, and with the aptitude of his family for entering early into a new project, Killigrew grasped the

[8] For the position of these two men in the development of the French romance see W. Von Wurzbach, *Geschichte des Französischen Romans,* Heidelberg, 1912, pp. 244–281.

[9] The *Ariane:* see below.

[10] J. B. Fletcher, "Precieuses at the Court of Charles I," *Journal of Comparative Literature,* I (1903), 120–53.

[11] Lady Love-all in *The Parson's Wedding:* see below, Chap. VI.

means of providing richer food for the jaded but fastidious tastes of his prospective audience. More than any of the plays of their time, his amateur dramatic attempts assumed the coloration of the new *genre* of French romance, and his plays found immediate inspiration in the *Ariane* of Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin.

Before indicating Killigrew's debt to the *Ariane,* it is necessary to point out that he had as his reading background the same material that had gone into the creation of the heroic romance itself. The method of plot-making, much of the story material, and the wide geographic range of the action in the type came originally from the Greek romances; and the *Clitopho and Leucippe* of Achilles Tatius had appeared in at least one English edition, and the *Ethiopian Romance* of Heliodorus in at least seven, before Killigrew began to write.[12] The dramatist was undoubtedly acquainted with both these works.[13] The heroic romance owed many of its sentimental subtleties, its fine-spun disquisitions on love and honor, its strange codes of etiquette, to the pastoral romance; and English readers had not only their native pastorals, but the *Astrée* of D'Urfé,

[12] A. Esdaile, *A List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed before 1740,* London, 1912, pp. 1, 75. (Testimony of the influence of the Greek romance has been offered by S. L. Wolff: *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction,* New York, 1912.)

[13] Killigrew is eclectic in the choice of names for his characters, but many of them can be traced to the prose romances. The names are usually altered, probably owing to Killigrew's irregularities in matters of spelling. "Theagines" and "Memnon," the names given a pair of characters in *The Prisoners,* are probably alterations of "Theagenes" and "Cnemon," which occur in the *Ethiopian Romance.* The name "Claricilla" itself may be a corruption of "Chariclea," the name of Heliodorus' heroine. (The translation of the Greek romances by Saintsbury, London, 1855, has been used by the present writer.)

translated in 1620, and the famous father of its kind, Montemayor's *Diana,* translated in 1598.[14] Killigrew's acquaintance with the *Diana* is attested by a passage in one of his plays in which the adventures of one of Montemayor's characters, Belisa ("divine Bellessa," as Killigrew calls her), are referred to.[15] The chivalric romance of Spain must have contributed to the French development something of the super-heroic quality manifest in the character of the hero with his all-conquering prowess; and the exploits of Amadis and the various Palmerines had been relayed to English readers, somewhat tardily to be sure, but in ample time for Killigrew to have enjoyed them.[16] That he was familiar with these as well as with the other romances is demonstrated by the plea of Thomaso to one of his friends, "Prithee let thine [offspring] be an Ethnick Knight and run wilde in the Wilde of Kent, a Pagan of the Pagans in Surry, and breed some new Romances; only breed him a Cavalier, that he may fight with the Palmerines, Olivers, and the Rolands of the Age. . . ."[17]

The French heroic romance would have found in Killigrew a trained reader of fiction, a connoisseur perhaps, in plots, love casuistry, and heroical characters. The amount of prose fiction available in England, antecedent in its nature to the French heroic romance, will explain why certain parallels to be indicated in Killigrew's plays and the *Ariane* might also be indicated

[14] A. Esdaile, *op. cit.,* pp. 102, 132.

[15] *Bellamira her Dream,* Part I, Act III, Scene 1, Folio, 1664, p. 491.

[16] Cf. H. Thomas, "The New Chivalresque Romances in England," Chap. VII in *Spanish and Portugese Romances of Chivalry,* Cambridge, 1920.

[17] *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* Part II, Act IV, Scene 12. Folio, 1664, p. 442.

in those plays and earlier English dramas: there had been a constant infiltration of certain material into English drama. However, the combination of materials in Killigrew's plays precludes the possibility that he was uninfluenced by the new French romance and simply levied upon older plays and older fiction. The coincidence would be too remarkable. In his plays and in the *Ariane* there is a certain mutual exclusion of material, as well as a mutual selection, which establishes a relationship. For instance, the Arcadian countrysides, the shepherds and shepherdesses of the pastoral, and the professional knights, the monsters and magicians of the chivalric romance, are in the discard. The positive similarities will be indicated at greater length.

Before listing the parallels between Killigrew's plays and the *Ariane,* a word concerning the copy of the romance which Killigrew may have used must be included. *Ariane* appeared anonymously in two volumes octavo in Paris in 1632. The English translation, the first edition of this type of romance to appear in London, was published in 1636: "*Ariana.* In Two Parts. As it was translated out of French, and presented to my Lord Chamberlaine." The work proved popular enough to have justified a second edition in 1641. If we have correctly dated Killigrew's plays, they were written just too early for the author to have read the English edition of the *Ariane,* for he was away from England during that portion of the year 1636 in which the series was completed. A courtier in the circle of Queen Henrietta Maria would scarcely need a translation of a French book, but even if we assume that

Killigrew could not read French at this time, which is after all quite possible, it does not follow that the contents of the *Ariane* must have remained inaccessible to him. There must have been much oral translation in these leisure days. Killigrew may even have read the published translation in manuscript. The volume "presented to my Lord Chamberlaine" may very well have been the work of a fellow courtier. Perhaps Killigrew's companion at this period, Walter Montague, was the man. This is not so much a chance shot as it appears, for Walter Montague did translate French works, and Killigrew was familiar with these translations before their publication. In *The Parson's Wedding,* written about 1641, Killigrew mentions an English translation of *The Accomplish'd Woman;*[18] in 1652, Walter Montague's translation of that work appeared in print.

The best proof that Killigrew was familiar with the *Ariane* is that he made use of it. His three tragicomedies are all plays of "love and honor," of heroic adventure and fine-spun sentiment. The author has produced three fugues upon a single theme, and each play presents a variation of essentially the same plot. In time of war, several brave and chivalrous princes fall in love (at first sight) with several beautiful and virtuous princesses. The princes are suffering some form of undeserved disgrace, and the princesses are the prey of a lustful villain. Feminine virtue and masculine prowess conquer all, and the lovers are united amidst cessation of international hostilities. It re-

[18] Act II, Scene 2, Folio, 1664, p. 89.

quires some hardihood to attempt to tell in a few sentences the story of one of the *romans de longue haleine* (although the *Ariane* is not as "long-winded" as most of the others), but the fact is that the skeleton synopsis given for Killigrew's plays also fits the romance of Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin. The romance contains a greater variety of adventures, and a number of sub-plots, but its general outline is also the general outline of any one of Killigrew's plays. The following characteristics of the French romance and the English plays are those which all four works have in common.

1. The action transpires in the midst of pseudo-historical events.

Ariane. Rome under Nero oppresses her Sicilian subjects (Part I, Book 1; Part II, Book 3). There is civil strife in Sicily (Pt. I, Bk. 7). Scythian barbarians wage war on Thessaly (Pt. II, Bk. 6).

Prisoners. War is waged on Sardinia by the King of Sicily (Act I, Scene 1 *et seq.*).

Claricilla. There is civil strife in Sicily, the King fighting for repossession of his throne against a usurper (I, 1 *et seq.*).

Princess. Rome under Julius Caesar has conquered Sicily, and led the Sicilian King and his sister into captivity. The Sicilians wage guerilla warfare on the Romans (I, 2 *et seq.*).

2. Kinsmen fall in love with kinsmen.

Ariane. Melintus loves Palamede's sister, Ariane; and Palamede loves Melintus' sister, Epicharis.

Prisoners. Hipparchus loves Pausanes's sister, Leucanthe; Pausanes loves the King of Sicily's sister, Lysimella; the King of Sicily loves Hipparchus' sister, Eucratia.

Princess. Facertes and Cilius (Lucius) love the sister of Virgilius, Sophia; Virgilius loves the sister of Facertes and Cilius (Lucius), Cicilia.

Claricilla. Two brothers, Melintus and Philemon, love Claricilla.

3. The heroes are under a cloud. Either their country has been subjugated and they have been made captive, so that they refuse to reveal that they are of noble parentage; or they are unaware that they are of noble parentage.

Ariane. Melintus discovers his father to be the noble and wealthy Hermocrates (Pt. I, Bk. 4, 8) and his mother to be Euphrosyne (Pt. II, Bk. 4). There are a number of such revelations in the romance: Epicharis is not known as the sister of Melintus until Pt. II, Bk. 6.

Prisoners. Pausanes and Hipparchus are freed slaves, who prove to be the sons respectively of the ex-rulers of Sardinia, Memnon and Theagines (V, 3).

Claricilla. Melintus, nephew of the King of Sicily but son of an unfortunate father, refuses to tell his name (I, 4), as does his brother Philemon until released from slavery (IV, 1).

Princess. Cilius (Lucius) is unaware of his royal parentage until told he is the brother of Prince Facertes (V, 8).

4. A parent or other kinsman of the heroine presents an additional obstruction in the path of true love.

Ariane. Aristides, father of Ariane, favors the suit of Marcellin to the prejudice of that of Melintus (Pt. I, Bk. 3). Dicearchus, uncle of Ariane, is the enemy of Melintus and favors the suit of Pisistratus (Pt. I, Bk. 8).

Prisoners. Lysimella has to plead with her brother to save Pausanes and his companion from the galleys (II, 1).

Claricilla. The father of Claricilla is ill-disposed toward Melintus and desires that his daughter wed Prince Appius (I, 1 *et seq.*).

Princess. Sophia has to plead with the King, her father, to spare the life of Facertes (I, 2).

5. A villain under the sway of lust and spite hates the hero and desires to ravish the heroine.

Ariane. Marcellin incenses Nero against Melintus (Pt. I, Bk. 1), and attacks Ariane (Pt. I, Bk. 3).

Prisoners. Gallippus joins forces with the enemy, and makes an attempt upon Lysimella (I, 1), and also Leucanthe (IV, 2; V, 1).

Claricilla. Seleucus betrays Melintus to the King of Sicily (III, 3), and lays plans to ravish Claricilla (V, 8).

Princess. Bragadine desires the death of Virgilius, and the spoliation of Cicilia (II, 4).

6. Pirates, under a leader who has previously been a person of some consequence, complicate the action by joining with the forces either of good or evil.

Ariane. The pirate Eurymedon joins forces with

Melintus, and subsequently proves to be his brother (Pt. II, Bks. 1, 4, 7).

Prisoners. The pirate band of Gallippus, an exiled Sicilian courtier, raids the coast of Sicily, joins forces with Sardinia; and later betrays Sardinia (I, 2 *et seq.*).

Claricilla. The pirate Manlius, formerly a Sicilian captain, aids Melintus to foil Seleucus (IV, 1 *et seq.*).

Princess. The pirate Teresius, formerly a Sicilian dignitary, is the secret friend and guardian of Cilius (Lucius) (I, 2; V, 8).

7. Poignance of situation is aimed at in having friend fight against friend, or brother against brother, because of temporary disagreement or mutual ignorance of identity.

Ariane. Eurymedon is vanquished and captured by his brother Melintus, and then becomes his ally (Pt. II, Bk. 1).

Prisoners. Pausanes, madly in love with Lysimella, and Hipparchus, loyal to their captain, Gallippus, fight for possession of the Princess. When Gallippus displays his inhumanity, Hipparchus goes over to the side of his friend Pausanes (I, 4).

Claricilla. Philemon besets Melintus in the wood, but upon recognizing Melintus as his brother, he joins forces with him against fellow assailants (IV, 1).

Princess. Virgilius and his brother-in-law to be, Cilius (Lucius), assail each other, and are parted

only through the timely arrival of mutual friends (V, 8).

8. The heroine finds love to be in conflict with honor.

Ariane. Epicharis loves Palamede, but resists his amorous advances (Pt. I, Bk. 5).

Prisoners. Lysimella struggles against her love for Pausanes considering him of lowly birth (II, 4).

Claricilla. Claricilla rebukes the impetuous advances of Melintus (I, 4).

Princess. Cicilia struggles against her love for Virgilius because he has been the enemy of her country (IV, 6).

9. The hero finds love to be in conflict with friendship.

Ariane. Although Melintus loves Ariane, he consents to court Emilio in order to advance the flirtation of his friend, Palamede, with Emilio's sister, Camilla (Pt. I, Bk. 1).

Prisoners. Pausanes fights his life-long friend, Hipparchus, for the sake of Lysimella (I, 4, as above). In this exceptional case love proves stronger than friendship, but the rift between the friends is quickly healed.

Claricilla. Philemon stifles his love for Claricilla when he finds his brother also loves her (II, 3).

Princess. Cilius (Lucius) resigns his claims to the love of Sophia when he learns his brother has previous claims (V, 8). Facertes squires Virgilius during his infatuation for an unknown captive, even though he feels that this infatua-

tion defeats all his hopes, including those of winning Virgilius' sister, Sophia (III, 6).

10. All obstacles are overcome, identities are revealed, and the lovers are united at a time of national or international pacifications.

Ariane. The various pairs of lovers are united; and Melintus becomes the ruler of Thessaly under the sovereignty of Rome. Nero has died and given place to the less objectionable Galba (Pt. II, Bk. 7).

Prisoners. There is a triple wedding, and Sicily and Sardinia become allies (V, 3).

Claricilla. Melintus weds Claricilla by the consent of her father, the King of Sicily. The threatened usurpation is averted, and the King is firm on his throne with Melintus as the heir apparent (V, 10).

Princess. There is a double wedding, and Rome and Sicily are united by family ties (V, 8).

These are by no means the only points of resemblance between Killigrew's plays and the *Ariane.* If the plays were to be compared individually with the romance, the list of parallels would be much longer. Nevertheless, even after setting upon ourselves the restriction of treating all four plots at once, we find that in our tabulation no important component of any one of them has had to be neglected. The ten components listed above compose a rather narrow frame and no other play of this period (not to mention any three plays by the same author) could be fitted into it. It is rather interesting that the romance is named after its

heroine and that Killigrew so named his play *Claricilla* —a gesture sufficiently novel in 1636 to be commented upon and imitated by Shirley.[19] The chief male character of this play is named Melintus. This was not a new name in English drama, but Killigrew's use of it is significant in the light of the fact that the chief male character of the *Ariane* is also named Melintus.

In the light of Killigrew's indubitable borrowings from Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin, it is enlightening to turn to the commendatory verse prefixed to the early edition of two of the plays. Henry Bennet lists originality among their many virtues:

> Nor yet enrich'd by others cost, or paine,
> But like Minerva, rais'd from your owne Braine.

And William Cartwright concurs:

> . . . here no small stolne parcells slily lurke,
> Nor are your Tablets such Mosaique worke,
> The web, and woofe are both your owne, the peece
> One, and no sayling for the Art, or fleece,
> All's from your Selfe, unchalleng'd All, All so,
> That breathing Spices doe not freer flow.

Not quite *All* we must reply to this, for Killigrew's plays are exactly what Cartwright says they are not— "Mosaique worke"; and yet the claim of originality made for the plays is by no means groundless. Killigrew could boast the type of originality current in his day—he was inventive if not creative. He borrowed the material for his plots, but his plots were his own. We must remember that those for whom the plays were

[19] See the Dublin prologue to his *Rosania* (c. 1637) in which *Claricilla* and Suckling's *Aglaura* (1637) are mentioned as examples of a new fad.

primarily designed were probably quite familiar with the *Ariane,* and that the plays must perforce remain "unchalleng'd." One, reading the romance and Killigrew's plays, would not be immediately struck by their basic similarity. The dramatist has put the "parts" together in entirely new combinations, and has employed his own emphasis. The plays are as different from the romance as they are different from each other. The following synopses will indicate the degree to which they are different from each other. Giving these synopses at length is justifiable, because the plays themselves are rather inaccessible, and because the ingenuity of their plots is after all their most notable characteristic. The story of *The Prisoners* is as follows:

Sardinia has failed to come to the aid of Sicily in a recent war, and now that the King of Sicily is at leisure to punish this neglect, he is preparing galleys for his neighbor's destruction. The fact that Sardinia is a pastoral, peace-loving nation, pledged against waging offensive war, does not seem to excuse her recent neutrality in the mind of the Sicilian monarch. While he is about his preparations, his own coasts are raided by the pirate Gallippus, who attempts to carry off his sister, the Princess Lysimella.[20] A previous attempt to ravish Lysimella was the original reason for the banishment of Gallippus from the Sicilian court, and for his changing his vocation from that of the courtier to that of the pirate. His present attempt upon Lysimella is thwarted only by the strange behavior of two of his own men. These are Pausanes and Hipparchus, two noble youths, the secret of whose birth is known only to their commander. When Hipparchus is ordered to convey the Princess aboard the pirate galley, he reluctantly obeys, even when his dear friend Pausanes, who has fallen in love at first sight with Lysimella, attempts to prevent him, at first by

[20] Lysimella is named "Cecilia" in the first printed version of the play.

persuasion and then by force. Although Hipparchus strikes down Pausanes in defense of his trust, he refuses to follow up his victory by obeying the savage orders of Gallippus that Pausanes be tortured and slain. Instead he changes sides, and the two friends unite to rescue the Princess and return her to her brother. They are coldly received by the King of Sicily, but the latter finally yields to his sister's importunities that her rescuers (the " Prisoners " of the play) be committed to her charge. Although she feels degraded by her attachment to a nameless wanderer, the love of Pausanes for the Princess is rapidly equalled by her love for him. Desiring that the two youths may be given all opportunities to distinguish themselves, she allows them to follow her royal brother to Sardinia disguised as common soldiers. Her hopes for them are more than fulfilled, and their individual prowess goes a great way toward defeating the Sardinians and the pirate band which Gallippus has put at the service of the enemy in order to further his own wicked designs.

It is in Sardinia that the real complications of this play begin. The temporary rulers of this utopian land are two fair maidens, Eucratia and Leucanthe; and in the very heat of battle the King of Sicily falls in love with the former of these charming enemies, and Hipparchus with the latter. The general amity which would naturally follow upon these instantaneous love affairs is disrupted by the pirate Gallippus, who betrays his allies and enemies alike by carrying off Leucanthe in his flagship. The King of Sicily charges Hipparchus with the pursuit of the pirate, and himself, Eucratia, and Pausanes follow close upon the pursuer with the remaining vessels of the Sicilian fleet. There is now a succession of scenes at sea, culminating in the portrayal of a terrific storm. The pirate ship is wrecked and Gallippus swims ashore with Leucanthe, whom he desires to save only that he may give her a choice of being seduced or ravished. His attempts upon her are thwarted by the timely arrival of Hipparchus, who, having landed together with the other pursuers, slays the pirate and saves his loved one. In the meantime his friend Pausanes makes an heroic rescue of another victim of the storm; and this latter turns out to be none

other than Lysimella, shipwrecked in a galley in which the power of her passion has made her follow Pausanes from Sicily. The principal characters (the King and Eucratia having landed at the same time as Hipparchus) are now all gathered together about the signal fire which has served to unify the complex action of these later scenes, and nothing remains to prevent a triple marriage except the lowly station of Pausanes and Hipparchus.

This objection is removed by an ingenious last scene. An old hermit, who has lit the signal fire and ministered to the needs of the succession of castaways, reveals his identity and that of an aged companion of his. They are Memnon and Theagines, once the co-rulers of Sardinia. They each had one son and one daughter, and because they disobeyed the statute against sending sons out of the country to be educated in foreign ways, they have long since been removed from office and banished from their native land. The sons whom they had sent out of the country were captured by pirates and have long been lost sight of, but their daughters remained to rule Sardinia and are, of course, Eucratia and Leucanthe. Gallippus revives just long enough to reveal that he is the pirate who captured the sons and that these are, to be sure, Pausanes and Hipparchus. Fortunately Hipparchus is the brother of Eucratia, so he is still free to marry Leucanthe. Pausanes is the brother of Leucanthe, and of rank enabling him to marry the Princess of Sicily. The King of Sicily bestows himself upon Eucratia; and the ruling families of Sicily and Sardinia are thus united by a network of marriages that would have made an old-world diplomatist desperate with envy.

Although Killigrew used almost exactly the same story elements in his second play as in his first, the fact is manifest only after close scrutiny. The story of *Claricilla* follows:

Silvander, the favorite of the King of Sicily, has so raised himself to power, that he has been able to slay the King's brother, defeat the royal army, and seize the throne. He now holds in

captivity Princess Claricilla, the King's daughter, love for whom has furnished the incentive for his treachery and revolt. Claricilla's transcendent virtue has preserved her chastity in her delicate situation; and lately she has not only resisted the usurper's importunities to marry, but has inveigled him to withdraw from his forces to a retired lodge, where the party of the deposed King is about to attack him. It is at this juncture that the play opens.

Leading the attackers are Prince Appius, whom the King has selected to be the husband of Claricilla, and Seleucus, Silvander's successor as royal favorite and (as it develops) his successor also as secret lover of the Princess—and one who, like his predecessor, finally sacrifices his honesty to his love. The attack upon Silvander is successful, but the honor of the day goes to neither Appius nor Seleucus, but to Melintus, a nephew of the King serving in his army in disguise. Just why Melintus is forced to assume a disguise is never satisfactorily explained, but it may be that the King has objected to advances he has made in the past to his cousin Claricilla. That a love affair exists between these two is soon apparent, for no sooner is Silvander slain and the Princess rescued than a violent courtship begins, abetted strangely enough by Prince Appius, who at the request of the Princess resigns his pretensions to her hand with almost impolite alacrity. It is Seleucus who presents the stumbling block to the lovers. In order to gain power over Claricilla by learning her secrets he stoops—reluctantly it must be said—to become the paramour of her maid, Olinda.[21] When he learns that Claricilla loves Melintus, he insults her in a fit of jealousy, and forestalls her complaint to the King by revealing the love affair between her and the common soldier. Melintus is banished the city, but not until he has wounded Seleucus in a duel. This duel had been pending for some time, but at Claricilla's request Melintus had hazarded his honor by deferring it. Timillus, a humorous companion of our hero, and one who relieves the tension of the play by showing perpetual amazement that so much trouble can be taken to

[21] As a reward for her treachery Olinda is summarily drowned in the last act.

win a woman, is left wounded on the field of honor while his chief takes to the cover of the neighboring woods.

It is at this point that another group of actors is brought into play. Tullius, a rather virtuous pirate, who has befriended Claricilla when she was held by Silvander, has been hovering about the coast, and his party encounters Melintus in the woods. As a capture is about to be effected, a young slave whom Tullius has recently liberated to reward a display of loyalty, goes over to the weaker side and aids Melintus to withstand the pirates. It develops that the young slave is really Philemon, brother to Melintus. He too has been a lover of Claricilla, but, being the absolute paragon of chivalry, he has relinquished his claims in deference to his brother. He has also adhered to the code of heroes of romance, who will never tell their names while in captivity, and has withheld his identity from Tullius, a person predisposed to befriend him. A league is sealed between the brothers and Tullius (now that the various identities are known), and the latter proceeds in disguise to the court. Between this new ally and Prince Appius a plot is hatched whereby Seleucus will be revealed in his blackest colors, and the lovers will be united. The King is informed of the identity of his daughter's lover and is told to be present at a secret meeting she has appointed with him. Seleucus is then offered the means to assassinate the King, seize the throne, and capture Claricilla. Tullius contracts to have a band present in the garden, where the King is to intercept the meeting between the lovers, and this will be at the command of Seleucus. Unwary of the trap, Seleucus, who has become more villainous with each succeeding scene, gladly accepts the offer. But the band supplied by Tullius actually consists of Philemon and other friends of Melintus disguised as slaves. These obey the orders of Seleucus until his commands fully reveal his villainy to the King; then they cast off their disguises and Seleucus himself is captured. He ends not without glory. After protesting his great love for Claricilla and obtaining her forgiveness, he dies by his own hand " as a sacrifice to her nuptials." The King, apparently dazed by the succession of revelations, forgets his animosity to the brothers and

blesses the union between Claricilla and Melintus. A very short, comic anticlimax is furnished by the hero's old lieutenant, Timillus, in a speech which concludes the play.

The third play of the group is apparently quite different from either of the other two. The story of *The Princess* follows:

Sicily has been conquered by Rome, the King has been slain, and his daughter, Cicilia, and his son and successor, Facertes, have been led into captivity. The Romans are ruled by Julius Caesar (not the more glorious " first Caesar "), and this ruler spares the life of the Sicilian prince at the plea of his daughter, Princess Sophia. Sophia has interceded for Facertes because in the past he has behaved in a chivalrous manner to her brother, Virgilius. Virgilius, it appears, shares with his father the honor of ruling the Romans. This much has happened before the opening events of the play.

A group of the defeated Sicilians have formed a pirate band in order to make predatory raids upon Roman shipping. During one of these raids, the Princess Sophia is captured; and, since she conceals her identity, she is destined to be sold in the slave mart of Naples along with other captured Romans. Her virtue protects her chastity from the pirates, especially from one captious lieutenant, who has her in charge and who helps to furnish the comic element in this play.[22] Sophia's virtue wins a substantial ally when one of the pirates falls in love with her.

[22] In this play we have the first instance in Killigrew of the use of a comic under-plot. The humorous Lieutenant and his chief (designated simply as " The Captain " although he turns out to be Terresius, a Sicilian of sufficient consequence not to be thought capable of indulging in such pranks) desire that old Tullius, a wealthy member of their crew, may die before the month is out in order that his goods may be shared while their own term in office continues. Officers are elected in this band, and, of course, officers receive the lion's share of the effects of a departed comrade. The attempt of the captain and the lieutenant to cajole, tease, or bully Tullius into dying promptly occupies three entire scenes, besides parts of others.

The name of this lover is Lucius, and he is to be elected captain of the pirates at the expiration of the term of the present leader. Although he is unaware of the fact himself, he is also a member of Sicilian royalty, being a brother to Facertes and Cicilia. We soon learn that the love of Lucius is hopeless, because Sophia is already in love with his brother, whom she has saved from the Roman vengeance of her father.

At present Facertes and Sophia's brother, Virgilius, having become fast friends in spite of the enmity between their respective countries, are making a journey together in order that Virgilius may have an opportunity to declare his love to Cicilia. Apparently Virgilius has fallen in love with this sister of his friend from no stronger provocation than hearing a description of her. The two friends do not have to journey far. While they are in Naples, Cicilia is placed for sale in the very slave mart for which Sophia is destined. She has been captured by a small group of the pirates, who have kept their prize secret in order to avoid sharing the profits of the sale. (Cicilia and an old retainer, Nigro, were being sent under charge of the Roman viceroy as "a present to the Emperor" when their ship was attacked. She has apparently maintained the silence customary among captives, for her captors seem unaware that she is a fellow countryman.) Virgilius sees Cicilia in the slave mart and falls violently in love with her, unaware that his previous susceptibility actually spares him the necessity. Many obstacles must be overcome before the two friends gain possession of the fair slave. She falls into the hands of Bragadine, son of the governor of Naples, who is more expeditious than Virgilius in producing her purchase price. It is only when Paulina, a fashionable courtesan (won to virtue by the salutary effect of gazing upon the noble Virgilius), comes to their aid that the two friends achieve their object.[23] Even then Virgilius has not overcome his difficulties, for Cicilia does not prove

[23] A considerable portion of the play is devoted to these complications in Naples, which, after all, form only an incident in the main plot. Allied with Bragadine in his conflict with Virgilius and Facertes is an old bawd, Olympia, whom Virgilius has incensed by repelling her amorous advances.

so ready as her brother in being reconciled to this Roman enemy. It seems for a time that Virgilius' rather conceited "If she be worthy of Virgilius, she must hate Virgilius" will prove to be more than prophetic. Cicilia hesitates long between love and honor, but finally finds a means to reconcile the two.

Since Cicilia's freedom has been gained at the price of Bragadine's death, the two friends and the Princess lose no time in escaping from Naples, taking along with them the reformed Paulina. During a storm at sea, the galley in which they have escaped is forced to seek harbor on an unfrequented coast, nearby, as it happens, to the stronghold of the Sicilian pirates. It is through this accident that the two groups of characters are brought together. The affairs of the pirates have not been without their own complications. Lucius (who by the way is known by the alias of Cilius) has been unable to beg or buy Sophia's freedom from the Captain. His own accession to authority will not begin in time for him to save Sophia from the slave-mart, so he has been forced to rely upon a plot. The slaves in the galley which is to convey Sophia to Naples are enlisted in his cause, and their chains are to be left unloosed so they may be free to save the Roman maiden by force. However, just before the galleys put off to sea after the storm, a meeting between a group of the pirates and the party which has just been driven to the coast saves the necessity of consummating this plot. The meeting is accompanied by complicated alarms and excursions. Virgilius and Facertes fight the pirates, but Facertes, together with Cicilia and Paulina, is captured. Separated from the main conflict Virgilius and Lucius engage in a desperate struggle, but are parted in the nick of time by the pirates and captives combined, among whom various recognitions have produced a coalition. Lucius is now told by the pirate Captain (who has been his true friend from the first) that he is really a prince of the blood. True to his exalted rank, this prince resigns his pretensions to Sophia when he

The plotting and counter-plotting to effect Cicilia's release occupy Scenes 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 in Act IV; Scenes 1, 4, 5, and 6 in Act III; besides several scenes in Acts I and II.

learns that his brother has previous claims. Sophia and Facertes are now united, and since the affair between Virgilius and Cicilia seems only to have been hanging fire until the usual double wedding could be arranged, the whole company repairs to celebrate the double nuptials. The Sicilian pirates may share in the rejoicing since Rome and Sicily are now united by reinforced marital ties.

One can readily see that, simply by recombining the same elements, the inventive dramatist might have produced an endless variety of plots.

The synopses given above for Killigrew's plays are deficient in that they furnish only a slight indication of the structure of those plays. Not only have a number of minor characters and incipient sub-plots[24] been ignored, but some of Killigrew's knots have been cut through by telling at once what the reader of the play must wait until the last scene to learn. The plays are baffling ones to read. Before we account this a weakness in the dramatist, we must recognize the effects he was striving for. In plays of this kind the chief aim was a series of surprises and revelations in the last scene. Since all was to be made clear at the end, conversely, it seems, nothing was to be made clear at any other point. Especially was it necessary not to give too much away at the beginning, so we find the expository portion of these plays extremely sketchy. The older dramatists were wont to display their threads, then to entangle them, and finally to disentangle them. The process was logical and satisfying. The dramatist of Killigrew's

[24] The most "incipient" of the sub-plots occurs in Act V, Scene 6 of *The Prisoners*. Ravack, a liberated slave, says, "I have a story too, but this is no time to tell it." The fact is, he never does tell it.

order presented a tangle at the beginning, then entangled it still more, and at the last moment made it vanish away—employing a little sleight of hand to do so. The process was illogical and, apparently, thrilling. Probably the audience of these tragi-comedies gave them the same variety of attention given a modern detective play. The endings of Killigrew's plays are swift-moving and ingenious, and there is a sweeping disregard for loose ends and the fate of minor characters.

That the dramatist consciously strove to be involved, is demonstrated by the fact that the last of the early plays is the most involved of the three. In certain other respects, however, the series indicates progress and a growing consciousness on the part of the author of the exigencies of the theatre. *The Prisoners* is a very grave play from beginning to end. In *Claricilla* a little comic relief is introduced by the bluff and faithful soldier, Timillus. In *The Princess* there is a complete comic under-plot. The plays are by no means uniformly amateurish and poorly done. The dialogue is spontaneous and flowing; and the scenes on shipboard in *The Prisoners,* those depicting the growing villainy of Seleucus in *Claricilla,* and those in which Cicilia struggles with her love for Virgilius in *The Princess,* display very genuine dramatic power. On the other hand, there is almost a total absence of characterization. Seleucus is the only figure in the series whose character shows any development through the course of a play. Perhaps his presence in the play, together with the fact that its plot is slightly less unreasonable than those of the other two, explains why *Claricilla* had the longest

life upon the stage. The other characters—the white heroines, the black villains, the golden heroes—are simply cut-outs, with movable arms and legs which may be adjusted into striking postures. Any apparent characterization is usually no more than some current theory being superimposed upon the puppets. The love-charmed Pausanes of the first act of *The Prisoners* seems different from his slightly ribald friend, Hipparchus (and comments upon the fact); but when Hipparchus falls in love also, the two friends become indistinguishable from each other and from the King of Sicily. The fact that the characters do not represent genuine human beings accounts for the fundamental lack of logic in the plays. Gallippus of *The Prisoners* did not become a pirate until banished from Sicily for attempting to ravish Lysimella. But it was as a pirate that he gained possession of the infant Pausanes. The man Pausanes becomes Lysimella's lover; and it requires no scientific mind to detect the unromantic fact that she must be old enough to be his mother. But Lysimella and her kind, unlike human beings, are unaffected by the passage of time. They never become old. Killigrew's characters were the contemporary generation of a race of creatures propagated through centuries of fiction. They were many a long romance removed from life.

Throughout the plays false poignance is effected by having the heroines roughly treated and the heroes perforated by wounds. The wounds bleed profusely[25] but

[25] The stage directions sometimes indicate that the wounded hero is to "squeeze a Sponge." His disguise is usually a—somewhat disfiguring—patch over one eye.

quickly heal, with or without the application of a sovereign balm. The mauling allotted the heroine never stems her flow of elevated discourse. Next to the plots of these plays the audience must have enjoyed most their sentiment—conveyed in rounded rhetorical periods. In spite of the abundance of action, the characters find time to hurl defiances, debate upon points of etiquette, lament their lot, describe their passion, and dilate upon their honor with eloquent and picturesque fluency. The language of Killigrew's plays will be discussed at greater length in a later chapter. This language is not poetic, but it is clear, forceful, and ornamental—by no means a type of language at any scribbler's command. Killigrew's plays provide an excellent example of the ultimate step in the disintegration of Elizabethan dramatic blank verse. The writers of the commendatory verses prefixed to the plays congratulate the dramatist upon his manly disregard for petty considerations of meter. They might have been more ingenuous. Killigrew was incapable of writing true blank verse. The lyrics in his plays are just as unmetrical as the dialogue. In *The Prisoners* Pausanes composes a song for Lysimella, bad enough to have permanently alienated her affections. The old knack for doing the thing had been lost. When the early plays were republished in the folio, they were frankly printed as prose. The rhythmic and rhetorical prose of the plays admirably harmonizes with their type. We need only take our minds away from older and greater plays, and view Killigrew's amateur dramatic attempts against a background of his times and his

circle, in order to concede him at least the merit of knowing how to please an audience.

Killigrew's early plays were probably first staged at private performances before the King and Queen at Hampton Court or elsewhere. Not only do they seem to have been especially designed for a courtly audience, but the public theatres were closed for eighteen months in 1636–1637 after the dramatist's return from Italy. When the theatres were reopened, Killigrew's plays were brought out at the Phoenix, or Cockpit, in Drury Lane. No note of the licensing of the plays exists in the surviving records of Sir Henry Herbert, but the title pages of the first edition of *The Prisoners* and *Claricilla* inform us of performances "at the *Phoenix* . . . by her M^{ties} Servants," information corroborated by mention of one of the plays in 1637 by Shirley.[26] That *The Princess* was also performed at this period we can ascertain from Pepys' comment on it in 1661: "the first time that it hath been acted since before the troubles." The plays seem to have remained in the possession of the Cockpit players, and in 1653 a clandestine performance of *Claricilla* was attempted at Gibbons's Tennis Court, near Lincoln's Inn Fields. The company was betrayed by an "ill *Beest*" and the performance was broken up by Commonwealth soldiers.[27] It is interesting to observe that there were spectators willing to rally together in defiance of the law to see one of Killigrew's plays. At the Restoration *Claricilla* was listed among

[26] See above, note 19.

[27] Discovery of this performance was made by L. Hotson, *op. cit.*, p. 49. Mr. Hotson identifies the informer as Will Beeston.

the stock plays of the Red Bull company,[28] and it was probably among the plays earliest revived at the period. Killigrew himself brought out *Claricilla* a number of times. We know of at least three performances through Pepys' *Diary:* July 4, 1661; January 5, 1663; and March 9, 1669. Pepys remarked on the first occasion that it was the first time he "ever saw it" and that it was "well acted." On the second occasion he branded it "a poor play." His remark on the third occasion was, "It do not please me almost at all, though there are some good things in it." It is less remarkable that the play kept the stage as long as it did when we consider that Killigrew occupied a very strategic position for a dramatist. The other plays did not fare so well. On November 29, 1661, Pepys made this interesting entry in his diary:

> To the Theatre, but it was so full that we could hardly get any room, . . . and there saw "Love at First Sight" [the sub-title of *The Princess*], a play of Mr. Killigrew's, and the first time it hath been acted since before the troubles, and great expectation there was, but I found the play to be a poor thing, and so I perceive everybody else do.

Another theatre-goer writing in doggerel to an out-of-town friend passed the same verdict:

> First then to speake of his Majesty's Theatre
> Where one would imagine Playes should be better
> Love att the first sight did lead the dance
> But att second sight it had the mischance
> To be so dash't out of Countenance as
> It never after durst shew itts face

[28] *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert,* J. Q. Adams, Ed., New Haven, 1917, p. 82.

> All though its bashfullnesse as tis thought
> Be far from being the Authors ffault . . .[29]

Apparently the Restoration audience did not care for *paleo-heroic* plays. The poor reception given *The Princess* must have discouraged the author from attempting to revive *The Prisoners,* for there is no record of a Restoration performance of that play.

After the first years of the Restoration, Killigrew's tragi-comedies disappeared from the boards, bowing before the greater brilliance of the rimed plays. They probably continued to be read, however, just about as long as the French and English heroic romances continued to be read. For about two centuries now they have remained quietly entombed in the folio, and their resting place has been undisturbed, except by a few of the more rugged scholars, and an occasional interloper who has merely wanted to look at Faithorne's engraving. The plays are dead, and no brief is held here for their resurrection. One may venture to say, however, that those who would understand the movements and transitions in English drama in the seventeenth century cannot afford to overlook Killigrew's pre-Commonwealth plays. One may also venture a protest against the unnecessary bitterness with which these plays are usually mentioned by commentators. Coming upon such plays at the fag end of his labors, a student of the period is apt to hurl harsh names at them—"degenerate tragi-comedies," "panders to depraved taste," and the like. Their type has even been held up as a symbol of the sinister forces corroding the character of the seven-

[29] The entire epistle is quoted by L. Hotson, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

teenth-century gentleman. The writer must confess that the plays have appeared to him to be very innocent productions. They are interesting examples of ephemeral literature; they reflect a quaint old fad. They show us what tragi-comedy had developed into; what that portion of the English audience whose influence on drama was becoming so potent had come to like; what the Restoration writers of heroic plays were to have as part of their background. These plays helped our ancestors to pass pleasantly some of their leisure hours, and the chances are that the gentlefolk for whom the plays were primarily designed were better engaged in watching them than in whatever else it was that they might have been doing. The playwrights themselves never suspected that future generations would suffer themselves to be annoyed by their productions. William Cartwright in his prologue to *The Royal Slave*, presented before the King and Queen at Oxford and Hampton Court, has anticipated the worst that any but the most vindictive readers of such plays can say:

> Things of this nature scarce survive that night
> That gives them Birth; they perish in the sight,
> Cast by so far from after-life, that there
> Is scarce ought can be said, but that they were.[30]

[30] The/Royall/Slave./A/Tragi-Comedy/Presented to the King and Queene/by the Students of *Christ-Church*/in Oxford./August 30, 1636./ Presented since to both their Ma/jesties at *Hampton-Court* by the/Kings Servants/The Second Edition/Oxford/. . ./1640.

VI

SEMI-PROFESSIONAL PLAYS

AFTER writing his three tragi-comedies, Thomas Killigrew put aside his pen and for several years produced no more plays. He probably believed at the time that he would have no occasion to indulge in this amusing pastime again. A talented young courtier might gain something by displaying dexterity in amusing the court with plays, but, after all, the avenue to substantial advancement was not literary achievement. In the years following the completion of the last of his amateur plays in 1636, there ensued Killigrew's marriage to Cecilia Crofts, the birth of his son, the subsequent death of his wife, and the beginning of his period of residence at the Piazza. In these years Killigrew was probably intent upon the serious business of winning promotion at court. But the times were never more adverse for young men whose only assets were their personal charms. The royal master was in political jeopardy, and impecunious courtiers were forced to shift for themselves. Killigrew returned to play-writing, but this time his intention was evidently to please a popular audience. The tag-epilogue to *The Parson's Wedding* contains a conventional plea for applause and seems to hold out the promise of a sequel. The sequel to the comedy was never written, but if the theatres had not been closed and if Killigrew had remained in

London, it is probable that this sequel and other "practicable" dramas would have been written, and that Killigrew would have depended for part of his income upon the precarious rewards of the professional dramatist. We may call *The Parson's Wedding* a semi-professional play.

The Parson's Wedding is a comedy of manners, and *The Pilgrim,* a later production which may also be classified as a semi-professional play, is a romantic tragedy. These two plays are not only cast in more standard moulds than the three preceding plays, but in other respects they differ from those plays growing out of a courtly fad and designed to please a special audience. The treatment is now realistic; more attention is given to characterization; and the plays are better fitted to the stage. Since the two plays are so different from each other in their types, however, and since they were written under quite different auspices, they must be discussed individually.

The most surprising feature of *The Parson's Wedding* is the shocking contrast it presents to the dramatist's earlier plays. In his tragi-comedies Killigrew did nothing if not ascend to idealistic heights; in his comedy he descended to corresponding depths. This phenomenon will be discussed at greater length hereafter, but one explanation of it rests in the fact that the tragi-comedies were written by a hopeful youth of twenty-four—and a lover—while the comedy was written by a temporarily defeated man of twenty-nine—a widower of several years standing. That five years intervened between the earlier plays and *The Parson's Wedding* is almost

certain. We must say "almost" because there is neither edition nor mention of the later play before the Restoration, and our knowledge of its date of composition rests entirely upon internal evidence. It is certain that the play was written before the outbreak of the Civil Wars, because it is a comedy of London life and the London portrayed is one in which the courtiers of Charles I are still pleasuring, and in which the theatres are still going in full blast. Fleay, who has discussed the date of composition of this play, has noted in it an allusion to the suppression of *The Whore in Grain* which was brought out "new-vamped" (and containing alleged libelous satire) in September, 1639, and he has used this allusion to fix the anterior limit for the date of composition.[1] But a later anterior limit is fixed by the satirical allusions to Parliament which run through the play. Parliament convened for the first time in ten years on April 13, 1640, so the play must have been written after this date. Since the April Parliament sat only three weeks before it was dissolved, and since the satirical allusions in the play seem to

[1] F. G. Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, 1559–1642*, 2 vols., London, 1891, II, 25, 326. The author, who is usually so felicitous in his conjectures, is somewhat contradictory in his dating of this play, for in spite of his "anterior limit" he says that the play was written during Killigrew's 1635 travels. It is true that the title page in the folio bears a statement that the play was written in Basle ("Basil") in Switzerland, where Killigrew may have spent a few days in December or January, 1635–36 (see above, p. 61), and a preliminary draft of the comedy may have been written at that time, but the play as we have it certainly belongs to a later period. The allusion to *The Whore in Grain* or *The Whore New-vamped* is in Act IV, Scene 4, ". . . let the Whore alone, till she wears out; nor is it safe to vamp them, as you shall find." Another possible allusion to the older play is the phrase "the cuckold in grain" in Act II, Scene 3.

apply better to the early activities of the Long Parliament, which convened on November 3, 1640, a still later anterior limit is suggested. The action of the play takes place during warm weather at a time of a decrease in the pestilence,[2] and after the various possibilities have been considered, the summer of 1641 seems to be the most plausible time to set for the period of composition. It is possible, however, that the play was written during the preceding summer.[3]

In accordance with his own method, and the method of his day, Killigrew neither invented the plot of his play out of the whole cloth nor followed sedulously any

[2] See the dialogue toward the end of Act III, Scene 1.

[3] The problem resolves itself on the one hand into whether the dramatist would have alluded to the 1639 suppression of *The Whore New-vamped* and have been so facetious in his remarks about Parliament as late as 1641; and on the other hand into whether his references to Parliament could have applied to the short sitting in the spring of 1640. Parliament's pious zeal, its close committees, and its actions to enforce the Statute of Monopolies of 1623 are alluded to: see Act II, Scene 4; III, 2, 5; IV, 1; V, 2 (Vol. XIV, pp. 421, 454, 465, 475, 509 in the Dodsley edition of 1875). Such a speech as "Marry, they are wise, and fore-saw the Parliament, and were resolved their Monopolies should be no grievance to the people" (Act III, Scene 2) seems almost certainly to arise out of the conditions which held during the early months of the Long Parliament. Although the subject of monopolies had been broached during the Short Parliament, definitive action only came later: see *Commons Journals,* I, 24 *et passim;* also Thomas May's *History of the Parliament of England,* Folio, 1647, p. 85. But if Killigrew's play came in 1641, it seems curious that he should have mentioned the trifling matters that he did and failed to allude to the epoch-making trial of the Earl of Strafford. May tells us (p. 92) "It seemed a very pleasant object to see so many Semproniaes (all the chiefe Court Ladies filling the Galleries at the Tryall) with penne, inke, and paper in their hands, noting the passages, and discoursing upon the grounds of Law and State," and we know of the furor caused by the trial from many sources. Perhaps Killigrew's play belongs to the summer of 1640 after all.

one source.[4] He took certain stock situations and combined them in a new pattern. Langbaine has called attention to one such situation which had previously been employed by Lodowick Barry in *Ram-Alley* (1609) and by Shakerley Marmion in *The Antiquary* (1636), but which was not "so well manag'd as in this Play."[5] The situation is one in which a woman is forced into marriage by a suitor who compromises her by stealing into her bedroom and allowing outsiders to see him at her window—such "an old stale trick," says Lady Love-all in *The Parson's Wedding*, "I've seen a ballad on't."[6] Thus in *Ram-Alley* William Smallshanks wins the widow Taffata,[7] and thus in *The Antiquary* Aurelio wins the disdainful Lucretia.[8] Another stock situation employed by Killigrew is that in which a man is betrayed into a compromising situation with a woman (preferably old and ill-favored) so that his enemies may gain power over him. This was on old theme in the continental novella and, in a mild version, had been

[4] Dibdin, in his *Complete History of the Stage*, London, 1753, IV, 93, names Calderón's *La Dama Duende* as the source of the play *Woman's a Riddle*, but his expression is so ambiguous that he seems to be naming Calderón's play as the source of *The Parson's Wedding*, which he is discussing. Since Dibdin's time *La Dama Duende* has frequently been named as the source of *The Parson's Wedding*, although no two plays could be more dissimilar. M. Summers in his edition of Killigrew's play (see above, note 17), p. xxiv, has put himself to some trouble to perform the melancholy task of enumerating those who have made this mistake about the source of the play. Curiously enough Killigrew may have got suggestions for his *Thomaso or the Wanderer* from Calderón's play.

[5] Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, Oxford, 1691, p. 313.

[6] *Dodsley* (1875), XIV, 715 (Act V, Scene 3).

[7] *Ibid.*, X (Act V).

[8] *Ibid.*, XIII (Act IV).

given an English habitation by Robert Greene in "Roberto's Tale" in the *Groatsworth of Wit*. Continental dramatists had borrowed the trick from prose fiction,[9] and Richard Brome in his *Play of the Novella* (1632) followed their example, causing a negress to be stolen into Pantaloni's bed at the house of the Novella.[10]

Killigrew's use of a situation which had appeared among other places in *Ram-Alley* is only one of a number of features which make his play resemble Barry's. The fact is that Killigrew leaned more heavily on Barry's play than his methods in his other plays would lead us to expect. The sub-title to *Ram-Alley* is *Merry Tricks,* and this title would also fit *The Parson's Wedding*. There is a general resemblance of design in the two plays. The expedients of a group of needy young gentlemen in the attempt to recoup their fortunes are depicted: in *Ram-Alley* these sparks are younger sons in the Inns of Court; in *The Parson's Wedding* they are gallants newly returned from France. Both plays are marked by ribaldry, and each shares a tendency to introduce topical allusions. In *The Parson's Wedding* one of the characters, the Captain, marries off his mistress to his enemy; so, in the older play, Smallshanks avenges himself upon Throat, a usurious shyster, by deluding him into marrying his mistress, Frances. In both plays the courtesan connives at the trick, and is presented as a sort of heroine. In both plays the marriage is attended by pecuniary advantage to the match-

[9] *Ibid.*, see Collier's note, XIV, 480; see also M. Summers, *Restoration Comedies,* London, 1921, p. xxvi.

[10] *The Dramatic Works of Richard Brome,* 3 vols., London, 1873, p. 123 (Act II, Scene 1).

maker, the bride robs her husband, is wrested from him shortly after the wedding ceremony, and is reunited to him later, after he has been sufficiently punished and subdued.[11] The only plot element of any importance in *The Parson's Wedding* which has not been touched upon concerns the impositions practised on one Lady Love-all by a group of young paramours, and no one source need be pointed to for such material; the conclusion of this episode, in which Lady Love-all is tricked into paying a tavern reckoning, employs a device as old as the primitive origins of the practical joke.

A brief synopsis of *The Parson's Wedding* will show how Killigrew has combined the various materials of his play:

Tom Careless and Ned Wild, after completing their educations by touring France in the manner of young gallants, return to London and proceed to prove that sobriety is not among the accomplishments acquired by foreign travel. In their pursuit of

[11] See *Ram-Alley*, Act I, Scenes 2, 3, *et passim*. There are a number of additional minor resemblances in the two plays. In the interview between Boutcher and Widow Taffata in Act I, Scene 1 of *Ram-Alley* (*Dodsley*, 1875, X, 283) the subject of the undesirability of widows in marriage is discussed, and this theme recurs in several parts of Killigrew's play. (See especially Act V, Scene 4.) The scene in which Widow Wild and Mistress Pleasant discuss the qualifications of various suitors, Act I, Scene 2, of *The Parson's Wedding*, reminds us of a similar discussion between Taffata and Adriana in Act II of *Ram-Alley* (*Dodsley*, X, 302), but this had been a favorite scene since the time Shakespeare had made such delightful uses of it. Other passages in *Ram-Alley*, especially when tavern scenes are in progress, and when satire is being directed at Puritans, etc., provide convincing proof that Killigrew was very familiar with Barry's play. It might be noted that in Marmion's *The Antiquary* there is also a situation in which an unsympathetic character is tricked into an unwonted marriage (Petrucio, see Act V); and in this play as in Killigrew's there is satire directed at young gentlemen who have been traveling to complete their education.

love, amusement, and the means to pay their debts, they ally themselves with two other sparks: Jolly, " An humerous Gentleman and a Courtier," and Captain Buff, " a Leading Wit, full of Designs." The first of the Captain's designs unfolded to us is his method of satisfying an old grievance by marrying off his mistress, Wanton, to a clergyman who has become enamoured of her. We can feel little sympathy for the Captain's victim: although the Parson's ruddy jowls shine " like the Primitive Lamps," he gives no other evidence of piety in any part of the play. Since the episode of the Parson's wedding gives the play its title, it might be well to follow it through at once to its conclusion. Merry Wanton makes the Parson such a wife as would satisfy any man's appetite for vengeance. She abuses him, robs him, and makes him witness her friendly response to the successive advances of each of the Captain's friends. Finally she connives at their plot to disgrace him utterly. An aged bawd is smuggled into the Parson's bed, and the crew of gallants, headed by the Captain, disguise themselves as the watch and arrest him on the charge of adultery. He is marched before Ned Wild (who enjoys the surprising distinction of being a magistrate) and is allowed to choose between going to Newgate or parting with a substantial portion of his income. The Parson chooses the second alternative, even though it is made clear that the money is to be used by his tormentors in entertaining his wife.

The overreaching of the Parson is only one of the little pranks which occupy these young bloods and aid them to solve their financial problems. Several of them in turn take such advantage of the amorous propensities of a certain Lady Love-all that they find themselves the richer by a number of her jewels. Lady Love-all discovers by accident that her retainers are much more interested in her gifts than in her other favors, and that she has been deceived in the hope of winning the handsome Ned Wild to her band of followers. She goes in dudgeon to a neighboring tavern where the friends are making merry, but is only welcomed by a chorus of insults conducted by the Captain. The episode is concluded when the company slips away and the drawer forces

their victim to pay six pounds—the reckoning for the banquet in which she has participated only as impromptu entertainer.

While the chief stress of the comedy is upon the divertissements which have already been described, these are really independent of what is properly the main plot of the play. This main plot involves several genuinely decent characters. Ned Wild has a young widowed aunt, and she enjoys the companionship of the charming Mistress Pleasant. Although these ladies are assiduously wooed by two dull country gentlemen, Constant and Sadd, it is made apparent that their beauty and wealth would make a more fitting reward for the obvious merits of Careless and Wild. But a match between Wild and Pleasant and between Careless and the Widow, is somewhat retarded by a feud which springs up between the sexes. Mistress Pleasant and the Widow have united to plague the men, while the men have plotted to take down the women. There is a dinner arranged at which not only the ladies and the two friends are present, but also Constant and Sadd, and Jolly and the Captain. Jolly and the Captain combine with Careless and Wild in a battle of wits with the ladies and their dull escorts. The gallants win the battle, but their dialogue is such that it might have curdled the ink with which it was written.

The cavalier behavior of the young gentlemen does not keep them long from their marital conquests. Constant and Sadd in an attempt to get the ladies away from the city conspire to have their dwelling quarantined for the plague. But contrary to the expectations of these rustic plotters, the ladies take refuge at the house of the Widow's nephew. It seems for a time that young Wild and his friend Careless intend to entertain their visitors civilly, but, moved by a new design of the Captain's to expedite the business of courtship, they consent to invade the bedroom of the ladies and appear there before witnesses so that their visitors shall be compromised. This is done, the Parson and his wife being introduced to take an active part in the plot, and the Captain and Jolly busying themselves to spread the report of a marriage, to invite guests, instruct musicians, and order a wedding

feast. In the morning when the ladies awake, they are greeted by such a hubbub that they have no choice but to marry immediately or lose their reputations. The marriages form a conclusion to their visit which does not seem to be strenuously repugnant to them. After a few more, rather desultory, scenes, the play ends with the Captain's securing the Parson's black robe so that he may act as Epilogue. In this rôle he urges Lady Love-all to incense the Parson to write a play against the courtier (Jolly ?) who has lampooned him in this one.

In spite of the abundance of intrigue and action in the play, the chief emphasis is not upon the plot but upon the ideas of the characters, and upon their frailties and foibles. The dialogue is nimble and witty, and in spite of the general low level of the topics of conversation, much of the repartee is extremely clever. Usually the wit rises out of the predilection of the characters for "railing" and is abusive in its nature. But this is not always the case. There is considerable shrewd and amusing satire directed against human weaknesses in general and against certain contemporary English institutions in particular. The point of view is that of an English Royalist and fashionable man about town in times of social unrest and political disturbances. Passages in the play provide a catalogue of the various things displeasing to a man with such a point of view. There are attacks directed against the military (Act I, Scene 1), against country life (Act I, Scene 3), against Parliament and political reform (see note 3), against dissenting clergymen and religious agitators,[12] and, of course, against creditors (Act III, Scene 5). For the first time in Killigrew, characterization approaches truth

[12] Half a dozen Puritan and other divines are mentioned by name.

to life, and characters even of the same type are distinguishable from each other. It is true that Ned Wild and Tom Careless tend to duplicate each other (as do Constant and Sadd), but there is a distinction between the experienced Widow Wild and the more spontaneous Mistress Pleasant, and the courtier Jolly is quite different from the more vulgar and roistering but less insidious Captain. Lady Love-all and the Parson are stock pieces—one the silly and amorous old woman, the other the splenetic and hypocritical target for abuse—but in Wanton we are introduced to a distinguished variety of courtesan. To her wit, beauty, and unscrupulousness, Wanton adds what her creator evidently intended to be intellectual perspicuity. She is, so to speak, the courtesan idealized. The construction of the play is not particularly good. Some scenes could be omitted altogether, and in others the dramatist has made cumbersome business of subsidiary action which any but a "semi-professional" playwright might have disposed of in a few lines. The play does not end where it should. After the action of the play terminates in Act V, scenes are added so that the play is distended through dialogue which might almost be called philosophical.

The first impression one gets of *The Parson's Wedding* is of its immorality. At first reading it seems to be not only immoral but antimoral. Sexual laxity is commented upon with disagreeable relish, and, in the specific instance of the Parson's wife, adultery is not only portrayed but is apparently condoned. It is impossible to justify this quality in the play, but it is pos-

sible to explain it. We have here a conscious reaction against the courtly cult of platonic love. Killigrew's earlier plays, while they did not exactly deal with platonic love, grew out of the same cultus which nourished that insincere variety of posturing. In this play the dramatist seemed bent upon showing the opposite side of the coin and upon dealing with the nether springs of human conduct. In a sense *The Parson's Wedding* is one side of an antithesis. When Wild consents to accompany his friends to a dinner given by the Widow and Pleasant, he does so,

> . . . upon condition you forbid the spiritual Non-sence the age calls Platonick Love.[13]

Throughout the play there is philosophizing upon the frailty and hypocrisy of woman, upon false and inconsistent moral strictures, upon the mutual disadvantages of married and single life, of loose and virtuous living —all antithetical in nature to the customary "platonick" philosophizing. When the friends convene in the house of the Widow, they strive to shock her and her companion Pleasant. They succeed in shocking these ladies and the modern reader as well. We must recognize this conscious desire to shock when we discuss the play. Although vice is put upon parade, the fact is that *The Parson's Wedding* is actually less immoral than other plays of its time, and than innumerable Restoration comedies. Killigrew succeeds in being indescribably coarse, but he does not reach to moral depravity. It is indicated at the end that Wild and Care-

[13] See the end of Act I, Scene 3. Of course Lady Love-all in the lower plane of action in the play is a travesty upon the platonic mistress.

less will make faithful husbands, and there are frequent intimations in the play that the professed sentiments of the characters are not the true sentiments of the author. Charles I and Henrietta Maria are alluded to in one speech: "... 'tis such an example to see a King and Queen good Husband and Wife, that to be kind will grow out of fashion;" (Act II, Scene 7) and unquestionably this is intended as a tribute. The best argument against true moral depravity in the play is the distinction made among the characters between the good women and the bad women. The Widow and Mistress Pleasant are good women, and with allowances for the usual freedom of speech of the time, their remarks are consistently clean. It is enlightening to hear the Widow exclaim during the dinner conversation in Act II, Scene 7, "Fie, fie, for shame, do not talk so; are you not asham'd to glory in sin"; finally as the ribaldry, which neither she nor Pleasant can stem, continues, she cries out wholeheartedly, "For God's sake, leave this discourse!" The line of demarcation between good women and bad women had not yet broken down. When we think of some of the conversation between polite ladies and gentlemen in the comedies of even as great a man as John Dryden, we realize that something may be said after all for the morality of *The Parson's Wedding*. During the Restoration there grew up a cynical disbelief in even the theoretical existence of a good woman, and to this Thomas Killigrew does not attain. The worst feature of *The Parson's Wedding* is really its terrible vulgarity, and this is a subject which can only be avoided. We must remember, how-

ever, that Killigrew belonged to a licensed class, and as late as the time of the *Spectator Papers,* as we learn from one charming informant, courtiers and gallants considered it their prerogative to use language that would have disgraced a fishwife.

The slow-moving last scenes of *The Parson's Wedding* are redeemed by the adroitly turned tag-epilogue, in which several characters discuss the play and one of them addresses the audience. We should be less surprised by this device in a Restoration comedy, but an interesting feature of Killigrew's play is that its familiarity, or the sense we have as we read that there is communication between the actors of the piece and the audience, reminds us constantly of Restoration drama. We are not surprised to learn that it was staged with success at the King's Theatre, opening October 5 or 6, 1664. A final touch (quite Restoration in its character) was given the bad taste of the play when the parts were assigned entirely to women. Pepys, who mentions this performance, heard the comedy characterized as "an obscene loose play,"[14] and we must admit with regret that the sentence was fairly just. Langbaine (who thought very highly of this play) informs us of a revival at Lincoln's Inn Fields, when a new prologue and epilogue were spoken by Mrs. Marshall in man's clothes.[15] This performance came after 1672 when the

[14] *Pepys' Diary,* October 6 & 11, 1664.

[15] Gerard Langbaine, *op. cit.,* p. 313. The prologue and epilogue, consisting of ribald witticisms in rimed couplets, are too regular in their versification to have been written by Killigrew. They were printed in *Covent Garden Drollery,* and have been reprinted by M. Summers in his edition of the play: see M. Summers, *Restoration Comedies,* pp. 3, 141.

King's company had been driven into Davenant's old playhouse by the fire at the Theatre Royal. Although these are the only recorded performances of the play, there were probably others, because this comedy must have been popular.[16] It is the only play by Killigrew which has been printed since his death, editions having appeared down until our own day.[17]

[16] Fleay (see above, note 1), believed that the play was produced at the Blackfriars before the closing of the theatres, basing his assumption on the phrase "a new play at the Friars" which occurs in Act V, Scene 1, and the allusion to "Stephen" [Hamilton] as the actor of the part of Wild in the tag-epilogue. But the "new play at the Friars" refers not to Killigrew's comedy but to a play which several of Killigrew's characters were planning to attend (and since the characters were ladies, it is natural that the Blackfriars theatre should have been selected); the reference to "Stephen" is inconclusive since by 1640 it is probable that the name had come to apply colloquially to any handsome actor. W. J. Lawrence (*Elizabethan Playhouse,* Stratford-upon-Avon, Vol. I [1912], pp. 93–96) considers Killigrew's play more likely to have been designed for the Cockpit, but believes it was not acted before the Restoration. The elaborate mounting of the play and the awkward arrangement called for in Act IV, Scene 6 (a double bedroom "all above, if the scene can be so order'd") he considers perhaps responsible for the delay in production. But this play is in fact not especially "elaborate" in its mounting, Killigrew's characteristically profuse stage directions merely making it seem so. The only real evidence that Mr. Lawrence (or Mr. Summers, who follows Mr. Lawrence) produces to prove the play was first acted at the Restoration is the entry among Sir Henry Herbert's accounts of a payment, dated November, 1663, of £2 opposite the name of Killigrew's play. The licensing fee for a revived play was only £1. But this is not conclusive. In the same entry (see J. Q. Adams, *op. cit.,* p. 138) it is shown that £2 was paid for the licensing of "Henry the 5th" which was scarcely an unacted play, and other irregularities occur in the accounts. The fact that £2 was paid to license *The Parson's Wedding* may only mean that payment of a fee had been evaded altogether in previous times. We cannot say whether or not the comedy was acted before the Restoration.

[17] Editions besides that of the folio are in *Dodsley* (1744), IX, 329–456; *Ibid.* (1780), XI, 367–536; *Ancient British Drama* (1810), III, 354–404; *Dodsley* (1827), XI, 449–585; *Ibid.* (1875, Hazlitt's edition), XIV, 369–535; Montague Summers, *Restoration Comedies,* London, 1921. Charles Lamb read this play, and printed a few lines from it: see Lamb, *op. cit.,* II, 366.

When one is discussing *The Parson's Wedding,* one is constantly forced into an apologetic vein by the questionable morality of the play, but when one turns to *The Pilgrim* this is happily not the case. *The Pilgrim* is nothing if not morally sound. In view of the fact that *The Parson's Wedding* has awakened some little interest and comment from time to time, it is remarkable that this other play by Killigrew has been consistently ignored. In many ways *The Pilgrim* is a better play than *The Parson's Wedding* or indeed than any other play that Killigrew has written. Still, the only critical comment that it has provoked was a chance shot by Dibdin, that it is "very little calculated for Representation,"[18] and a curt statement by Genest (who actually read Killigrew's plays) that ". . . the Pilgrim is a good Tragedy—with judicious alterations it might have been made fit for representation."[19] Langbaine had been non-committal about *The Pilgrim,* so that such of his successors as Cibber, Dibdin, and Baker found themselves at a loss as to what to say about it without putting themselves to the trouble of reading it. Modern historians and students of the drama have failed to mention the play, because surveys of the drama either end at the year 1642 or begin at the year 1660, and *The Pilgrim* comes between these dates.

In fixing the exact date of *The Pilgrim* we are introduced to a new type of problem, because the dramatist has, in this one instance, supplied the date for us but the date he supplies is apparently incorrect. The title

[18] Dibdin, *op. cit.,* IV, 93.

[19] John Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage, 1660–1830,* 10 vols., Bath, 1832, I, 391.

page of the play in the folio states that *The Pilgrim* was written in Paris in 1651, but there is nothing more certain than that Killigrew was not in Paris at any time in this year. His embassy to Italy began in 1649 and ended in 1652;[20] during the year 1651 he was at Venice, submitting his testimonials at regular intervals at the Collegio.[21] It is possible that the misstatement in the folio concerns the place rather than the date of composition, and that *The Pilgrim* was written in Venice; but this is not likely. Either the author or the printer would have been more likely to make a mistake in the date than in the place, and, more important, *The Pilgrim* is quite unlike certain plays which the dramatist actually did write in Venice. These plays are long and wandering compositions never intended for the stage. At the time Killigrew was writing them there was no English stage in existence or in immediate prospect, and the dramatist contented himself with writing closet drama. *The Pilgrim*, on the other hand, is a stage play, and in determining its date we may inquire into the auspices under which it might have been written, using Paris, the place of composition, as a clue. We have seen that Killigrew was sent on his first mission from Paris to Italy in April, 1647.[22] Where he was just before this employment, we do not know, but the chances are that he was in Paris cultivating the friendship of the young Prince Charles. At some time between the arrival of Prince Charles in Paris in the summer of 1646 and November of that year, a troup

[20] See above, Chap. III, pp. 86–97.

[21] British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, ff. 10–15.

[22] See above, Chap. III, p. 82.

of strolling English actors attached itself to his service; and the Duke of Newcastle, and perhaps other exiles, wrote for this company. We learn from *Mercurius Candidus* of November 11–20, 1646, that

> The company of English actors that the Prince of Wales had, are for want of pay dissolved . . . the English audience being there so poor and few, that they were not able to maintain the charge of the stage.[23]

It is entirely possible that Killigrew wrote *The Pilgrim* in 1646 for this Paris company. We have seen that he referred to himself during the Exile as Master of the Revels,[24] and it may be that he had some part in the management of this company; after the company dissolved, he would have been free to be sent on the money-borrowing expedition to Italy. There is no evidence by which we may prove these assumptions, and there is no record of a performance of *The Pilgrim* before the Restoration or after.

The tragedy itself is such as might have been written to please the exiled English gentry. Except in the comic interlude (which could and should be omitted in presentation), the horse-play of *The Parson's Wedding* is eschewed. For part of his material the dramatist returned to certain of the motifs he had used in his early plays; for instance, there are two young princes, each of whom loves the other's sister. The villain of the piece, too, is brought to his punishment by a device very much like the one Killigrew had used in *Claricilla*. But the dramatist did not rely only upon his old stock: he

[23] Quoted by L. Hotson, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

[24] See above, Chap. IV, p. 116.

found suggestions for details of plot in Davenant's *Albovine,* and elsewhere in contemporary drama, while he chose as the chief source of his play *The Politician* of James Shirley. The basic situations in *The Pilgrim* and *The Politician* are identical. In Shirley's play, the King of Norway has taken as his second wife, Marprisa, who is the secret mistress of his counsellor, Gotharus. Marprisa and Gotharus plot to wrest the succession from Turgesius, the son and rightful heir of the King, so that their own son, Haraldus, will be exalted. Haraldus thinks he is the lawful son of Marprisa by her first husband, and is in no sense party to the guilty designs of his parents. We need only substitute the names, *Julia* for *Marprisa, Martino* for *Gotharus, Alphonso Duke of Milan* for *King of Norway, Cosmo* for *Haraldus,* and *Sforza* for *Turgesius,* and we have in the above the basic situation in *The Pilgrim.* Killigrew's play is original, however, in that Sforza is altered into a more sympathetic if less belligerent character than Turgesius, and Cosmo is made the most active force in the play, in contradistinction to Shirley's pathetic and ineffectual Haraldus. Killigrew, too, places considerable stress upon the relations between Cosmo and Sforza, and upon the love affairs in his play—elements missing in *The Politician.* The plays are alike in the important point that the chief brunt of their tragic force is born by the innocent son of a sinful mother. Those familiar with *The Politician* will be aware of the relation of that play to the older and greater play of *Hamlet*—in which, also, a high-minded prince is brought into shocking consciousness of a mother's

guilt. In some respects *The Pilgrim* resembles the possible prototype of *The Politician* more than it does *The Politician* itself. Killigrew was of course familiar with *Hamlet,* and the ending of his play follows the ending of Shakespeare's more closely than does Shirley's; Cosmo ultimately causes the death of Martino, whereas Gotharus in *The Politician* comes to his end by an entirely different kind of agency. Shirley's play is a tragicomedy, whereas Killigrew's is a tragedy—the more fitting vehicle for the theme. Like Shirley, Killigrew probably had a background in Italian history. The conjunction of "Cosmo" and "Sforza,"[25] the names given the two rival but friendly princes, is interesting in light of the fact that a friendship between Cosimo de Medici and Count Sforza (ultimately Duke of Milan) is recorded in Machiavelli's *Florentine History.*[26] It is possible that Machiavelli's *The Prince* played a part in shaping Killigrew's conception of the character of the ruthless Julia, who says among other things in the same vein:

> Nothing was ever call'd Treason when the Traytors stood; Laws are fit to bind the people, Princes are above them, and the wisest make them their servants.[27]

In the play, the scenes of violence and treachery have about them that dark atmosphere which the history of the strife among Italian ruling families usually evoked in the works of English dramatists; we have here an Italy quite different from the Italy of Killigrew's earlier

[25] Shirley uses versions of both these names, but in different plays.

[26] *The Works of the Famous Nicolas Machiavel* ("newly translated into *English*") Folio, London, 1675, Book VI, p. 127.

[27] Act I, Scene 2, Folio, 1664, p. 162.

plays. A synopsis of *The Pilgrim* may perhaps clarify some of the points which have been discussed.

Milan has recently conquered Pavia, and Alphonso, the Duke of Milan, has married Julia, the Duchess of Pavia. The Duke of Pavia has been killed, apparently during the war between the two states. Alphonso has taken Julia's daughter by her first marriage, one Fidelia, into his care and she is being reared with Victoria, his own daughter by a previous marriage. Cosmo, the son of Julia, showed great prowess on the side of Pavia in the recent war, and for this reason, the magnanimous Duke Alphonso has made his step-son General of the army of Milan. Alphonso's own son, Sforza, has been made Governor of the conquered state of Pavia. Union between the erstwhile enemies promises further to be cemented, because love affairs are ripening between Cosmo and Victoria, and between Sforza and Fidelia. This is the situation when the play opens.

We soon learn that the Duchess Julia is not worthy of the kindness she and her children have received from Duke Alphonso. Julia has long been the mistress of Count Martino, once the favorite of the Duke of Pavia and now the favorite and counsellor of the Duke of Milan. Cosmo is really the fruit of the sinful union between these two, and not, as he thinks, the son of the Duke of Pavia. It is Martino's desire and Julia's passion that this son of theirs shall succeed to the rule of the two states instead of Sforza, the rightful heir. As wife and favorite respectively of the present ruler the two are in a peculiarly advantageous position for treachery. They have laid their plans to kill Sforza, and, since Fidelia has been sounded and found incorruptibly in love with this Prince, the unnatural mother has decided that she must die as well as he. Cosmo of course knows nothing of these schemes on his behalf, for like Sforza, who has become his fast friend, he is the soul of honor. A serious illness overtaking Duke Alphonso and threatening to leave the throne vacant, the plans of the conspirators are hastened, and they take the initial step of breaking the friendship between Cosmo and Sforza. Both are

sent letters notifying them of their dismissal from their respective offices, and to each it is privately intimated that the other is responsible for his dismissal. Cosmo hastens angrily to Milan, but learns from his sister Fidelia a hint of the true state of affairs. Disguised as a pilgrim, he proceeds toward Pavia to meet Sforza and ascertain the truth. The meeting takes place at the River Po,[28] and Cosmo is just in time to save the life of Sforza from Count Baptista, an exiled malcontent whom Julia and Martino have hired for the assassination with promises of the person of Fidelia. While Cosmo remains to secure from the dying and repentant Baptista a letter and a token which will win him admission to the conferences of Julia and Martino which he is now determined to surprise, Sforza proceeds to Milan unaware of the identity of his deliverer. Arrived in Milan, he goes to Victoria and Fidelia to tell them of the attempt upon his life. In order to spare Fidelia's feelings, he suppresses her mother's part in the plot and does not let her see Baptista's commission for the crime until he has first crossed Julia's name from it. Nevertheless Fidelia is offended that her lover should be the one even to remind her of the iniquity of her mother. She dismisses him angrily, and he goes to vent his soreness upon Martino. In the meantime, Victoria, who is more practical than the lovers, takes the incriminating commission to Duke Alphonso (who has miraculously recovered from his illness), and Martino's arrest is immedi-

[28] The plot to assassinate Sforza at the river involves the taking over by the conspirators of the ferry, and the dramatist makes use of this opportunity to introduce the ferryman and his family in a comic underplot. Trevallin, the ferryman, is carrying on an amour with the servant maid, Moretto; and Argentin, the ferryman's wife, is similarly engaged with the man-servant, Bertolin. Both husband and wife are very jealous of each other, while Bertolin is a trickster bent upon making the situation serve his own ends, financial as well as amatory. Attempts on the part of the several couples to find suitable trysting places, betrayals, discoveries, and consequent persiflage and horseplay, divert the reader for several scenes. Bertolin becomes master of the situation, and is about to gain Moretto for his wife along with a considerable portion of his master's property. But the wrath of Argentin, whom he has treated scandalously, breaks about his ears and he receives the roughest treatment of the four.

ately ordered. His guilt is confirmed when they find him and Sforza, heir apparent to the Dukedom, fighting violently in his chambers. Fearing that everything is now discovered, Julia resorts to a new plot suggested by one of her accomplices, Carlo, whereby she is to denounce Martino and accuse him of the additional crime of murdering Cosmo, her son, thus averting suspicion from herself. Martino can afterward be released from prison by Carlo, who is Governor of the Castle.

The desperate expedient of the conspirators is momentarily successful, but Cosmo, whom Julia thought to detain from court by her agents, has returned and, in his pilgrim's disguise and with Baptista's letter, has won his way into her confidence. He has been standing by during the preparations for Martino's denunciation so that he realizes the depth of his mother's villainy—everything in fact except that she has borne him illegitimately. Nevertheless, now, and during a long trial scene in which Julia affects to accuse Martino, and Carlo affects to defend him, Cosmo delays to act. Evidently he desires to spare his mother, while Sforza and others in the court divulge only half their knowledge because they wish to spare the feelings of her daughter, Fidelia. Martino's fate is left undecided by Duke Alphonso until the report of Cosmo's death may be verified, and this respite gives Julia and Carlo opportunity to release him and proceed with the murder of Sforza and Fidelia. Cosmo allows their plans to go so far, and then steps in and has his soldiers kill Carlo while he himself kills Martino. Everything points at this time to a propitious ending (Sforza and Fidelia having patched up their quarrel in their time of mutual danger), but such is not to be. Cosmo has allowed his solicitude for his mother to carry him too far. He goes to tell her that the death of Sforza and Fidelia has been accomplished, and he dwells pitifully upon the fictitious fate of Fidelia, hoping thus to awaken some pity in the mother. Then the bodies of Martino and Carlo are to be brought in and the attempt to reclaim Julia completed. But the effect of the " Pilgrim's " display of pity is anything but that calculated. Julia, considering him " too pityful a fool to trust a crown to," stabs him. The next

moment the body of Martino is brought in, and she learns in a breath that her son has unknowingly killed his father and she has unknowingly killed her son. In horror at finding "All that I loved dead, and all those I hated living," Julia turns the knife upon herself. She lives long enough to show some repentance and to bless the daughter she has hated, advising Fidelia with her last breath to continue in the paths of virtue.

The play has a dignified conclusion. With Cosmo dead, Victoria decides to enter a nunnery; Fidelia, unwilling to bestow her cursed stock upon Sforza, wishes to follow Victoria. But Sforza loyally persists in asking for her hand, and the Duke his father confirms him in the action, pausing at the end to pronounce the usual speech of benediction.

One can see that we have here the conception of an excellent plot. In accordance with the usages of his school of play-making, Killigrew has introduced a number of complications which he did not find in his sources, but the structure of his play is never so complex that its story is not perfectly clear. In fact the dramatist seemed so anxious on this occasion to be clear that he has introduced explanatory speeches to the point of repetitiousness. In order to exploit a situation dramatically effective, Cosmo is made to "discover" and comment upon his mother's iniquity upon several successive occasions. One feels as one reads the play that previous revelations should diminish the shocks felt by Cosmo on later occasions, and the effect is, finally, that he seems mentally inaccessible. But on the whole the play has fewer weaknesses and inconsistencies than any of Killigrew's dramas. The comic underplot, which occupies the whole of Act II, Scenes 3, 4, and 5, is unamusing and absolutely unrelated to the main plot; the play would be improved if this interruption

were removed from it. This might also be said of the long trial scene which slows up the speeding action of Act IV. The speeches of the antagonists and mock-antagonists are eloquent and forceful, and develop cleverly turned arguments, but they are tremendously long; and the scene, while interesting in itself, would spoil the play upon the stage. It is curious to observe the manner in which Killigrew's fund of pseudo-romantic material has mingled itself in this play. Fidelia is a heroine whose sensibility reminds us of the heroines of the dramatist's early tragi-comedies, and both Cosmo and Sforza are overnice in the point of their honor. There is an over-use of disguise, of tokens, of letters lost and found, that reminds us of the fictional and dramatic romances; still these intrusions are not sufficient to spoil the excellent main theme of the play.

Except in certain minor episodes the action of the tragedy rises naturally out of the characters portrayed. Characterization is more decided here than elsewhere in Killigrew's plays. Victoria is a heroine whose common sense and capacity for action distinguish her from Fidelia and Fidelia's kind, while Cosmo, her moody lover, is portrayed with some care and effectiveness. There is a very decided attempt to deal realistically with the character of Julia. Her villainy and blackness of heart have had their origin in some obscure early wrongs she has suffered, while the immediate springs of her actions are her Machiavellian philosophy, her lust for power, and her great though guilty love for Martino and, more especially, for Cosmo. Martino himself is not always a mere stock villain. He reveres Julia, and

it is her compelling power that makes him overcome certain qualms of conscience he feels toward the end of the play. The characters speak a language in this play somewhat different from the artificial rhetoric of the tragi-comedies. The speeches are often prolix, but on the other hand they are often powerful. There are interesting verbal reminiscences not only of *Hamlet* but of other plays of Shakespeare and the older dramatists. An interesting parallel to a passage in *Hamlet* occurs at the conclusion of Act III, Scene 5. Hamlet, about to task his mother for her sins, says,

> Soft! now to my mother.
> O heart! lose not thy nature; let not ever
> The soul of Nero enter this firm bosom;
> Let me be cruel, not unnatural;
> I will speak daggers to her, but use none:

Cosmo, in an identical situation, says,

> But for thee, O Julia, my unfortunate Mother, though I will not lift a hand against thee; yet I have words in store that shall wound thee deeper than a sword.[29]

When Killigrew attempts, as he frequently does, to reproduce the burden of some memorable dramatic speech in a speech of his own, he always puts himself at a disadvantage.[30] He has a true command of lan-

[29] See page 186 of the Folio.

[30] A brief illustration may be of interest. Shakespeare's

> "There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
> Rough-hew them how we will."

is altered, most unhappily, by Killigrew into,

> "Men may the metal bring, but the form
> of our happiness the Gods appoint us still."

The Princess, Act III, Scene 6; Folio, 1664, p. 29.

guage, but he is not a poet. In a play like *The Pilgrim*, poetry should supply a lift to the scenes of violent passion, of sin and bloodshed, and to true poetry Killigrew never attains. He has, nevertheless, put himself about in a sincere effort to produce in this play a good piece of work. He has given us in *The Pilgrim* a dignified and interesting tragedy—a play chiefly remarkable for its revelation of potentialities. We must remember that nearly five years intervened between the early tragicomedies and *The Parson's Wedding*, and at least five years between *The Parson's Wedding* and *The Pilgrim*. Had Killigrew's dramatic efforts been less sporadic, and had the dramatist been less preoccupied with other things, he might have written plays which students of the drama could not afford to ignore with such happy abandon.

VII

"CLOSET DRAMA"

IT has been implied from time to time in preceding chapters that Thomas Killigrew was a dramatist with ulterior motives, that he began to write plays as a means of attracting attention to his polite accomplishments and later became interested in the stage for its financial or professional possibilities. These implications are quite justified; we have, nevertheless, evidence that Killigrew was sincerely interested in literary endeavor, and derived pleasure from writing plays. As Oliver Cromwell wound the reins of the English government more and more firmly about his hands, and as the Exile wore on and threatened to be interminable, the dramatist began to write for his own amusement. His plays were no longer written with a stage in view, and *Cicilia and Clorinda, Bellamira her Dream,* and *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* the last of his plays, were designed to be read and not acted: to stage any one of them would daunt even the intrepid producers of German opera. Each of these plays is divided into two parts consisting of five acts each, but since there is absolutely nothing in the nature of a dénouement at the end of the first part, each of them in effect is (and will here be considered as) a ten-act play. Any one of the ten acts may contain as many as ten or more scenes. In spite of their monumental length, and

in spite of the fact that in two of them the dramatist relapsed into his old mode of ultra-romantic tragi-comedy, these "closet dramas" are not without interest to the student of literature.

Killigrew began to write these plays in order to occupy his leisure while he was serving as ambassador to the states of northern Italy. We know from the title pages of *Cicilia and Clorinda, or Love in Arms* that Part I was written in Turin,[1] and Part II in Florence. The play therefore must have been written from November to January, 1649–50, during the early part of the author's embassy.[2] Just before Killigrew had left Paris, there had been launched upon the world that leviathan, *Artamène ou Le Grand Cyrus* by Mademoiselle de Scudéry,[3] and the ambassador found a means of stowing the first part of the romance among the equipment for his journey. The length of *Cicilia and Clorinda* is more understandable when we realize that Killigrew found its source in *Le Grand Cyrus;* that is, in a four-hundred page fraction of it, *The History of Aglatidas and Amestris,*[4] in Part I, Book 3. In this

[1] It is interesting that this play begun in Turin should deal with the more ancient and more idyllic Savoy and Savoyards.

[2] See above, Chap. III, pp. 89–92. *Bellamira* was also written in Italy, so that Denham's allusion to "six plays" by Killigrew (see Chap. III, p. 99) must indicate the four parts of these two tragi-comedies, and the two plays, still in manuscript at the time, which have been discussed in Chapter VI.

[3] For the date of publication see W. Von Wurzbach, *op. cit.*, p. 280.

[4] Since the sources for only two of Killigrew's plays have been previously suggested, it is curious that *Cicilia and Clorinda* should be one of them. Langbaine, *op. cit.*, p. 312, says "The first scene between Amadeo, Lucius, and Manlius seems copied from the characters of Aglatidas, Artabes, and Megabises in the Grand Cyrus"; and not the first scene only but the

portion of Scudéry's romance, Aglatidas tells of meeting, and falling in love with, Amestris, the universally beloved. When the hero describes his first sight of Amestris, and says, ". . . le premiere instant de cette fatale veuë, fut le premiere de ma passion,"[5] Killigrew must have recognized congenial material. Scudéry deals with the irreproachable propriety of Amestris during the attentions of Aglatidas and the brothers, Megabise and Arbate. In Killigrew's play the peerless Cicilia corresponds to Amestris, the magnanimous Amadeo to Aglatidas, and the brothers—jealous Lucius and warlike Manlius—to Megabise and Arbate. Killigrew's villain, Orante, was obviously suggested by "le plus méprise & le plus hai" Otane of Scudéry. The relations of the drama and its source will be discussed more fully below; at this point it might be best to make the reader acquainted with the plot of Killigrew's play:

Marius, Rome's lieutenant-governor of Lombardy, has sent another army to try once more to effect the conquest of the neighboring domain of Savoy. The people of Savoy are simple shepherd folk, not without their rustic nobility. In the long struggle against Roman conquest all of their princes have been slain except Amadeo and his sister, Clorinda. Amadeo has recently escaped from Lombardy, where he was held prisoner by the Romans, and where he fell in love with the daughter of the enemy governor, the fair Cicilia. His love seems not to have been altogether unrequited, although Cicilia at the opening of the play has yielded her heart to another. Cicilia's choice is Lucius, a general in the Roman army now invading Savoy.

main theme of the play derives from the romance. In the edition of the romance which has been used in the present study, the name *Arbate* occurs instead of *Artabas;* the name may have been *Artabas* in English editions.

[5] *Artamène ou Le Grand Cyrus . . . Par Mr de Scudery . . . Troisiesme Edition . . . Paris . . . M. DC. LIII,* 10 vols., I, 732.

Lucius takes a personal interest in the invasion because of his animosity to his recent rival Amadeo, who rules Savoy and leads its army. All the other Romans including the Governor and Manlius, a brother of Lucius, like him a general in the army (and like him beloved of a Roman maiden—Calis, companion of Cicilia), seem rather to admire the brave Savoyards. This is especially true of Otho, son of the Roman Governor and brother of Cicilia. Otho seems to be interested in commanding the Roman army chiefly because the invasion will bring him nearer to the lovely Amazonian enemy, Clorinda. These in general are the relationships, and this in general is the situation when the play opens.

The war in Savoy is prosecuted with shifting success, but with uniform chivalry marking the actions of both armies. Finally Amadeo, by a display of politic magnanimity to Manlius, whom he has captured, succeeds in accomplishing that which even his great courage might have failed to accomplish. An honorable peace is concluded, and Amadeo and his sister proceed to Lombardy with the Roman army to effect a ratification with the resident dignitaries.

During the journey, and after the arrival in Lombardy, the affair between Otho and the Savoyard princess makes rapid progress so that everything seems to indicate that Clorinda will soon be the daughter-in-law of the Roman Governor. But since heroes of romance cannot resist their predilection for double weddings, Otho will not be satisfied until he urges upon his sister Cicilia a match with Amadeo. In doing this he disregards the wishes of Amadeo, who is diffident of his merits but who prefers to urge his own suit. Otho also disregards the claims of Lucius, and receives the news of Cicilia's secret betrothal to him with high indignation. Cicilia already has one difficult young man upon her hands. Lucius has been a jealous lover, so much so that Cicilia has constantly questioned the merits of his passion for her in long involved disputations with her friend Calis. Since Amadeo's return to Lombardy, Lucius has become so inflamed that Otho's anger promises to meet with more than its

return in his. In order to circumvent a conflict between lover and brother, Cicilia succeeds in having her father confine both young men to their chambers. But Lucius escapes, and gives a written challenge to Amadeo, who is at large and may thus satisfy the jealous lover's appetite for an immediate fight. The challenge, by a series of accidents, comes into the hands of Cicilia, and proves to contain an impeachment of her faithfulness. She is prostrated at the lengths to which the jealousy of Lucius has carried him, and everything seems to point at this time to the ultimate success of Amadeo's suit. Officers are dispatched, of course, to prevent the duel.

While the challenge letter has been changing hands, Amadeo has gone to meet Lucius, the latter's animadversions upon Cicilia giving him a just cause for combat. The place appointed is Juno's grove, and the duel is complicated by the fact that the brother of Lucius is hovering in the vicinity. This brother, the martial Manlius, has recently experienced some radical changes of heart. Ever cold to love in the past, and especially cold to the advances of the enamored Calis, he has of late been violently smitten, first with Clorinda, betrothed to Otho, and secondly with Cicilia, betrothed to his own brother. He realizes the enormity of his offense, but he has been reckless enough to disclose his passion to Cicilia, and her noble rebuff has made him so much the more conscious of his degradation that he is ready to sink to still lower depths. When he finds Amadeo and Lucius about to fight, he runs amuck and fights with both. This strange triangular combat comprises the opening scene of Part II of the play. The officers appear before fatal injury is done. Manlius is taken in charge, and under the solicitous attentions of Calis he recovers his senses so that in a short time he is reconciled to bestowing himself upon this preternaturally constant maiden. Lucius escapes the officers and takes shelter in the cave of a local hermit. Advances are made by Calis and a friend of his, Dyon, so that a reconciliation may be attempted with Cicilia. Lucius is finally won over and Cicilia seems inclined to hear his pleas for forgiveness. But while these secret negotiations are on

the point of bearing fruit, Lucius suffers so many jealous relapses that Cicilia is finally incensed to the point of wishing to do him a real injury. She decides that she shall be revenged upon him by offering herself to another. This other is not to be Amadeo, the uniform nobility of whose behavior has been such that she could not marry him without suspecting a mixture in her own motives. She decides to accept someone she hates.

It will have been noticed that the story as it has been outlined thus far has failed to bring into play a real villain. Those who have transgressed have done so while crazed by the extremities of their love, and love works such havoc among these characters that all allowances must be made. There is a villain in the play, however, and one with every adjunct and appurtenance. This is Orante, a hunchbacked and degenerate Lombard prince, who has been proscribed for the disagreeable advances he has made to Cicilia. He has only appeared as a potential force in the first part of the play, but now he assumes active importance, and is at this very time haunting the neighborhood of the court disguised as an old woman and prepared to kill his two rivals and to carry off Cicilia. Cicilia, unaware of his proximity, hits upon this very Orante as the one to whom she shall offer herself in order to punish Lucius and, for some obscure reason, to castigate herself. Calis is horrified at the proposal, but she agrees to squire her friend in the undertaking, hoping that she may somehow prevent the sacrifice. During a hunt which is planned for the morrow, the two friends plan to disguise themselves as boys and set out on a journey to find Orante.

Orante has hit upon this very hunt as the occasion to commit his murders and to carry off the Princess. He succeeds in wounding Manlius (as a sort of preliminary exercise) and his victim is taken in charge by the Hermit so that by this means he and his brother Lucius are brought together in friendship for the first time since the duel over Cicilia. They soon find a common cause in which to employ their swords. Orante and his followers, coming upon Cicilia and Calis in their boys' disguise, attack them without waiting to commit the preliminary murders. The maidens

defend themselves bravely, and when Lucius and Manlius come to their aid, the struggle becomes truly titanic. All of Orante's followers are slain, but the two brothers are so seriously wounded that Orante is left possessor of the field. Cicilia turns her dagger upon herself, but Orante's designs upon her threaten nevertheless to be consummated. At this point Calis, who has escaped just after the general fighting, returns with Amadeo, and the latter promptly ends the career of the Lombard Prince. Just before his end, Orante learns that Cicilia might have been his without force, and his final speeches are not lacking in passionate grandeur. Our attention is now turned to the wounded. If Lucius would considerately die at this point, Amadeo might be rewarded with the hand of Cicilia, who, in spite of her wounds, could certainly be revived. The reader expects this conclusion, but the dramatist has chosen another. In spite of his querulous jealousy, Lucius has been such an intense lover that he deserves consideration. Furthermore, he now lies wounded upon the field of battle, with Cicilia, whose constancy he can nevermore suspect, lying wounded beside him. It would almost seem that the author could not resist the temptation. The two break out into such fervid protestations of love that it would be impossible to dispose of them except to each other. The Hermit arrives with a healing balm and Lucius is saved. Amadeo steps forward to consecrate the lovers to each other. The matches which conclude the play, then, are between Lucius and Cicilia, Otho and Clorinda, and Manlius and Calis.

It will be noticed that in giving Amadeo a sister, Clorinda, and Cicilia a brother, Otho, and in developing a love affair between Clorinda and Otho as well as between Cicilia and Amadeo, Killigrew has employed the same plot materials he had previously used in his tragi-comedies and in *The Pilgrim*. The material he took from the *History of Aglatidas and Amestris* was introduced with numerous alterations and interpola-

tions. Scudéry's narrative is, in fact, so remarkably deficient in action and in what we ordinarily term plot that it would have been impossible to use it in any other way. What Killigrew has done has been to take the characters and the theme of the romance and to supply incident and action. His borrowings are unmistakable. Manlius precisely duplicates Arbate, who, until love finds him, ". . . aimoit assez la solitude, & n'aimoit guere la conversation des Dames."[6] Arbate, just like Manlius, is overpowered by his love although he is painfully conscious that that love involves treachery to a brother and a friend. Scudéry's *History* resembles drama in the single point that it progresses almost entirely through conversations; and there are several scenes in *Cicilia and Clorinda* which parallel what we may call the "scenes" of Scudéry. But in each instance Killigrew has added something in the nature of dramatic tension. In the scene in which Manlius reveals his passion to Cicilia and is roundly rebuked (Part I, Act V, Scene 1), Killigrew is following Scudéry rather closely, but he introduces the device, familiar in drama, of making Manlius blurt out the secret of his love only after he has taken encouragement from a false interpretation of the kind words of Cicilia. It would be interesting to set down side by side the parallel passages in the play and in the romance,[7] but the incredible loquacity of Scudéry's characters makes extensive quotation impractical. In the romance the dialogue is cold, formal, pallid; in the play it is forceful and passionate.

[6] *Artamène ou Le Grand Cyrus*, I, 758.

[7] See I, 824 *et seq.* in the romance.

Amestris, when she detects Arbate's purpose, goes so far as to tell him he is likely to make her prefer "la solitude à la conversation," and the tepid indignation of her later speeches reaches its climax in her suggestion to him ". . . chercher le repos dans vostre Cabinet." We may compare this with Cicilia's:

> Go hide thy self, false man, till thou can'st repent the injury thou hast done thy Brother; and if there be any spark of that honour left in thy heart which the world took fire at, let shame kindle that flame again; Go repent, sleep and forget this treacherous act, and wake again worthy of thy Brother and thy friend:

Whatever we may say of Killigrew's play, we can insist that it improves upon its source. Although *Cicilia and Clorinda* is often verbose, artificial, and highly inflated, it contains realistic touches, and some whole scenes which are dramatically effective. The chief characters are the unreal, sentimental creatures of heroic romance, but there are minor characters who are quite sensible and human. When we consider this production not as a stage play, but as a dramatic tale, we must concede Killigrew credit for having written a rather graceful, and (according to the standards of its kind) a rather successful story. It is long, but when compared to the fiction of its day, with which it must in fairness be compared, it is the soul of brevity.

Although Killigrew's next play, *Bellamira her Dream or the Love of Shadows* is precisely of the same type of composition as *Cicilia and Clorinda,* it is not nearly so successful. *Cicilia and Clorinda* is by no means free from absurdities, but *Bellamira her Dream* is inundated with them. The author had worked out the vein of

this type of writing, and nothing remained but to deal in strange extravagances. Title pages inform us that both parts of the play were written in Venice, so the ambassador must have been occupied with this play during scattered intervals from 1650 to the spring of 1652. The material here is largely that of the dramatist's older plays. Again we have scenes of civil strife, with reconciliation brought about through interlocking love affairs between a brother and sister of one faction and a brother and sister of another. The incidents of the play comprise a sort of compilation of the incidents of heroic fiction. There is the dream prophetic of impending occurrences, the hero who falls in love with the heroine's portrait, the faithful retainer who proves to be an exiled prince, etc. Not only Scudéry, but La Calprenède and others were pouring forth their romances by 1650, and their volumes must frequently have been the companions of Killigrew in his pergola at San Cassano. The play is reminiscent not only of French heroic romance but of older prose fiction, including the pastorals.[8] Among older romantic dramas *Cymbeline* can certainly be reckoned as a source. Shakespeare's Guiderius and Arviragus, the exiled sons of Cymbeline leading a sylvan existence in the cave of the banished lord, Belarius, are imitated by Killigrew in the characters of "Pollidor" and "Phillora," who are placed in an identical situation in the cave of the banished lord, Ravack. Even one of the names has been borrowed. In *Cymbeline* Guiderius is reared by Belarius under the name of "Polydore," and in *Bel-*

[8] The allusion in this play to a character in Montemayor's *Diana* has already been mentioned: see above, Chap. V, note 15.

lamira her Dream "Pollidor" is again the alias, employed by Ravack instead of his ward's real name, Prince Genorio.

Since few in these days are likely to read *Bellamira her Dream,* a synopsis of the play may be acceptable:

A number of years before the time of the opening events of this play, the King of Sicily and his brother, the King of Naples, engaged in a fratricidal war. In this war the King of Naples was slain and his brother came to rule over both states. The two brothers had each a son and a daughter. The children of the surviving brother have now reached maturity: they are the beautiful Bellamira and the gallant Leopoldo, popular with the subjects of both domains. The King their father does not share this popularity, and the play opens with him preparing to defend his crown in a civil war. The populace is rising in the name of Genorio, son of the slain King of Naples. The whereabouts of this Prince and his sister is not known, but Almanzor, a prince of Spain, has promised to produce him. Almanzor is taking part in the offensive against the King of Sicily from interested motives. His advances to Bellamira have been rebuffed, and he hopes to win by war what he was unable to win by the gentler forms of courtship. Clytus, Governor of the Fort of Naples, is the leader of the native enemies of the King. Between Clytus and his ally, Almanzor, strained relations soon develop because the latter delays in fulfilling his promise to produce Genorio.

The truth is that Almanzor knows nothing of Genorio, and has only claimed a knowledge in order to foment this quarrel and have a pretext for engaging in it. Genorio, unaware of his princely heritage, is actually living in the forest not far from the King's court. He and his sister, under the names of Pollidor and Phillora (by which we shall henceforth call them), are being reared as simple foresters,[9] and live in a cave attended only by a

[9] In betraying the identity of these "foresters" at this point I confess to applying the knife to the tangle of this plot. We are not told who these foresters are until nearly the end of this long play. Even the dramatis personae holds back the information.

tame satyr. Living with them is their supposed father, Ravack, a lord who was banished by the King of Sicily for adherence to the cause of the enemy in the old war. Ravack does not contradict the claims of Almanzor, because any enemy of the present ruler is welcome to him in his desire to restore the nephew and niece of that ruler to their right. Into this complex political situation comes love to produce more formidable complexities. The Princess Bellamira is beloved by Palantus, general in the royal army, and Palantus in return is beloved not by Bellamira but by Bellamira's friend, Fidelia. Bellamira herself loves a "Shadow"—that is, she loves the figure of a noble woodsman or shepherd that has appeared to her in a dream. This dream, incidentally, contained other elements, which have been interpreted, and prove to forecast the outcome of the impending war. It requires no feat of the reader's imagination to discern at this point that the dream-lover of Bellamira is her cousin Pollidor. It only remains for Pollidor to fall in love with Bellamira, and for his sister, Phillora, and her brother, Leopoldo, to fall in love with each other: then no matter what the outcome of this war may be (so long as the intruder Almanzor is disposed of) marriages may unite the conflicting royal households, and a happy ending may be anticipated. We have not long to wait for the inception of a love affair between Phillora and Leopoldo. Leopoldo, coming to the aid of his father with his army, is resting near the forest when Phillora comes upon him. She is in angry pursuit of her tame satyr, whose two weaknesses, those of being enamored of her and given to secret tippling, have combined to make him steal a kiss. In the presence of Leopoldo she forgets her recent animosity, and falls in love at first sight, while the Prince, moved by her beauty and the noble bearing which pierces through her rustic garb, promptly returns the compliment. Phillora is so smitten that she will not rest until she wins her brother and even Ravack to fight on the royal side in the threatening war.

This war breaks out, and is presented to us in a series of battle scenes, which conclude at the defeat of the royal army. The King is badly wounded and, after giving a picture of his daughter

Bellamira to Palantus, who has been a faithful officer throughout the conflict, he is carried off to be cared for by Ravack, who seems to have a somewhat different design now upon his old enemy. Palantus is taken prisoner of war and is robbed of the picture of his loved one. The same soldiers who have robbed him attempt also to rob Leopoldo, who has likewise been taken prisoner. But Leopoldo kills his aggressors and disguises himself in the clothes of one of them. As he does so the picture of Bellamira falls from the pocket of the uniform and remains unnoticed on the ground. Later it is found by Pollidor, who is immediately smitten by the face portrayed, so that by this complex means he too is now in love with a "Shadow"—happily with precisely the proper one. There is now a series of escapes and recaptures until Bellamira, her hopeless lover Palantus, her lover Pollidor (who is also hopeless but with less cause), and Phillora are all imprisoned in the same cave by Almanzor. Phillora employs this opportunity to chide her love-sick brother who, while he was heart-free, had little sympathy for her love for Leopoldo. Leopoldo, meanwhile, in his disguise as a Spanish soldier has gained the confidence of Almanzor and has been placed as a guard over these prisoners. He comes to them, of course, to prepare them for an escape.

The long scene in which Leopoldo reveals his identity to the prisoners and aids them to straighten out their interrelations is probably unsurpassed for its turns and convolutions in the whole range of drama. The upshot is that Palantus is made to realize that if he is to win a wife, it is not to be Bellamira but her friend Fidelia; while Bellamira and Pollidor, the shadow-lovers, and Phillora and Leopoldo, the victims of love-at-first-sight, are all rejoiced to discover that their several passions are reciprocated. It only remains to prove that Pollidor and Phillora are gentle-born before matches may be arranged. Of course an escape from the clutches of Almanzor is first necessary, and this is achieved when the prisoners, going to the aid of some Moorish comrades in captivity,[10] find that these Moors have been pestered by foxes

[10] The royal party has had a faithful Moorish retainer throughout the play. This is Arcus, who is really a Prince in his own country, but whom

almost as much as they themselves have been pestered by love. Where the foxes got in, the prisoners get out, a subterranean exit conveying them to the seaside, where Fidelia, Phillora's satyr, and another retainer who has remained outside of Almanzor's pale, are preparing to escape to sea. Almanzor himself is seriously considering escape at this time, for the threatened break with his ally, Clytus, has taken place. In fact the opposing sides in the war into which he has intruded have become reconciled through Ravack's disclosure of the probable marriage alliance between the two royal houses. Almanzor wishes at least to make sure of his prize, Bellamira, and upon discovering the escape of the prisoners, he pursues them to the seashore. His retainers are defeated in a pitched battle with the escaped prisoners, and he himself is slain —a victim of the folly of interfering in family quarrels. Other characters arrive upon the scene at the end of the conflict, and Pollidor and Phillora learn their true identity, while Leopoldo and Bellamira learn that no obstacles of birth debar them from their loved ones. To round out the number of marriages, Palantus and Fidelia join hands, while two of the Moors also yield themselves to Hymen—thus demonstrating that to effect the multiple matches at the end of his romance, an author will tolerate no prejudices against race or color.

When Genest in mentioning this play spoke of its "strange jumbles,"[11] he was entirely justified: although in synopsis it may not seem much different from *Cicilia and Clorinda,* it is in reality distinctly inferior. Neither as a play nor as a story has it much to recommend it except occasional passages of felicitous language. One interesting feature of the play, however, is the manner in which the dramatist has framed

exile and misfortune compel to conceal his true rank. For a time he secretly loves Bellamira, but one of the Moors who has fallen into Almanzor's hands and is released by Leopoldo and his party is Cadess, an old sweetheart of his, and Arcus wisely returns to his early love.

[11] John Genest, *op. cit.,* I, 391.

some of his scenes. The play was not written for the stage, and like *Cicilia and Clorinda* it has no stage history, but the author was writing in the dramatic form, and he included stage directions which, considering their date, are rather enlightening. A few illustrations will suffice:

> The Scene must be a fine Land-skip, and a Cave must be in the Scene. (Part I, Act I, Scene 4.)
>
> Leopoldo, solus: . . . Here they are within this place; the darkness will assist my Design, in hearing what they say; and when I will I can by the benefit of this light discover my self. [He turns his dark Lanthorne] The Scene opens and discovers a Prison, where Pollidor and Phillora appear next the Stage chained to a Ring fastened to the ground; upon the other side of the Prison, and in a darker part of the Scene lies Palantus chained; behind them in the dark, Bellamira chained, and afar off in prospective other Prisoners and dead Carcases. (Part II, Act III, Scene 1.)
>
> The Scene of the Prison shuts. Enter as out of a Cave, by the Seaside, frighted, the Satyr and Fidelia, Arcus and Philemon. . . . They no sooner enter the Grot, (which must be made in Prospective to present a Cave by the Seaside,) but they hear one knock within. (Part II, Act V, Scene 1.)

Killigrew was not writing for the theatre, but he was writing in the dramatic form, and was dealing, in his imagination at least, with a type of stage which is frequently, if incorrectly, considered a Restoration innovation. His stage directions could not have been added later, when the play was about to be printed in 1663, because they are connected organically with the play itself and, in order to add them, whole scenes would have had to be rewritten.[12] The future manager of the

[12] Killigrew was not the type of author who revises his work. Such revision as was necessary (in the spelling for instance) was probably left to the printer.

Theatre Royal (who was not a writer of court masques) was making use of the perspective scenes and mechanical arrangements of the "Restoration" stage eight years before the termination of the Exile.

It is unfortunate, of course, when a play must offer its chief interest in its stage directions. This need not be said of the dramatist's next, and concluding, play. After writing *Bellamira her Dream,* Killigrew allowed several years to elapse before he again took up his pen. The refining influence of Scudéry and her kind had apparently been removed by this time, for the dramatist, while persisting in writing "closet drama," terminated his literary efforts in a roistering comedy, *Thomaso or the Wanderer.* The date of this play is closely fixed by internal evidence. The bitter allusion to the Dutch, "whose Mist of ignorance hangs upon them still, and though the English *Olivers* rod be over them, yet their hearts are hardened against poor Cavaliers,"[13] sets an anterior limit in the early spring of 1654, at which time Admiral Tromp's fleet had been defeated, and the Dutch had made peace with Cromwell, agreeing that "that they should not suffer any of the King's party . . . to reside in their dominions."[14] A posterior limit for the date of composition is set by another passage:

Johan. Hot-spur's grown old too, his Gout requires ease; and from head Ostler of the Court is become Chamberlain with staff and keys.

Carlo. Yes, for the young Prince is from the Indies come; and though his brave Sea-horse founder'd in his journey home,

[13] Part II, Act V, Scene 7, Folio, 1664, p. 455.

[14] Edward, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England,* 7 vols., Oxford, 1849, V, 319.

> yet the poor Jades are now become his cares; he's no more Admiral, but Palatine Polyxander, great Master of the Mares.[15]

The allusion is to Prince Rupert's appointment as master of the horse after his return from his disappointing naval expeditions; he replaced Lord Percy ("Hotspur") who was mollified with the appointment to the office of lord chamberlain.[16] But since Rupert resigned the office of master of the horse by June, 1654, it is unlikely that the above allusion, and others like it in the play, would have been written after that time. *Thomaso or the Wanderer* belongs then approximately to April and May of 1654.

As was his custom in writing comedy, Killigrew went for his sources to older plays. When Aphra Behn was accused of stealing the plot of Killigrew's comedy after the Restoration,[17] she defended herself by saying that her accusers might just as well have claimed that she had stolen it from Brome's *Play of the Novella.* It is true that Killigrew had drawn upon Brome's play. Brome had caused his Novella to pose as a courtesan and create consternation in Venice by offering her charms at the price of 2000 ducats a month; Killigrew's Venetian courtesan, Angelica Bianca, creates a disturbance in Madrid by the same means: in both plays the charmers sing at their windows, while appraising listeners of various nationalities pass below.[18] But Killi-

[15] Part I, Act III, Scene 2, Folio, 1664, p. 344.

[16] Edward, Earl of Clarendon, *op. cit.*, V, 373.

[17] See below, p. 229.

[18] *The Play of the Novella,* Act II, Scene 2: see *The Works of Richard Brome,* I, 129; *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* Part I, Act II, Scene 3.

grew's play was influenced still more by Thomas Middleton's *Blurt Master Constable* (1601), from which it followed suggestions both in its main plot and in one of its under-plots. In Middleton's play, Hippolito, who has recently returned from the wars, favors his friend Camillo's suit to his sister, Violetta. But Violetta falls in love with a gallant soldier of another nationality, Fontinelle, and allies herself with him against his aggressors, Hippolito, Camillo, and their party. Violetta finds a rival for the heart of Fontinelle in the élite courtesan, Imperia. In *Thomaso or the Wanderer* we have a variation of this situation and a rough correspondence of Thomaso to Fontinelle, Serulina to Violetta, Don Pedro to Hippolito, and Angelica Bianca to Imperia. It must be said for Killigrew's hero that, unlike Middleton's, his affair with the courtesan takes place before marriage rather than after it.[19] The sub-plot of Middleton's play concerns the misadventures of the Spaniard, Lazarillo de Tormes, who is cozened and abused in the house of the courtesan; and this finds its counterpart in the unhappy experiences of Edwardo in

[19] We can never be sure in this play how many of the incidents relate to actual experience. Thomaso's pursuit of Angelica, a courtesan *par excellence*, reminds us of a passage in a letter written by Sir Alexander Gordon, a friend of Killigrew (see above, Chap. II, p. 64), to Lord Feilding when both Gordon and the dramatist were touring Italy: "I found so mutch suspision in all the Spaniards at Millan that I durst not adventur to stay abov tuo nichtis ther . . . I haid all the tym of my stay tuo spyis that folued me up and down the town. They found the most pairt of my bisiness to consist in waiting upon the braiv Julia, quo is the most teaking curtisan that evir I sau in my Lyf tym. Scho hes more knowledge in evry bisiness, both stait and galantry, then could be expected in any sutch creatur. (*Historical MSS Commission*, MSS of the Earl of Denbigh, Part V (1911), p. 23.)

Killigrew's play.[20] One situation in Thomaso, that in which Don Pedro pursues his own sister whose identity is concealed by a disguise, may derive directly or indirectly from the Spanish source, Calderón's *La Dama Duende*.[21] Other situations belong so much to common stock that they need not be commented upon, and still others are so robustious in their nature that they probably have no literary antecedents. Two rather remarkable verbal borrowings in the play have been noted by the early commentator, Gerard Langbaine. Angelica's song in Part I, Act II, Scene 3, "Come hither, you that Love, and hear me sing of joys still growing," is taken from Act IV of Fletcher's *The Captain;* and the long quack-medical monologue of the mountebank Lopus in Part I, Act IV, Scene 2 is a piecing together of Volpone's speeches in imitation of Scoto Mantuano in Act II, Scene 2, of Ben Jonson's comedy.[22] In each of these cases Killigrew's borrowings were from such well-known plays that he is not open to the charge of sneak-thievery. "Come hither, ye that Love," was

[20] *Blurt Master Constable or The Spaniard's Night-Walke,* Act III, Scene 3; IV, 1, 2, 3 (see *The Works of Thomas Middleton,* Alexander Dyce, Ed., 5 vols., London, 1840, 1, 223–308).

[21] In Calderón's play the episode involves Don Luis and Doña Angela in Act I, Scenes 1, 2, 3: see *Teatro Selecto de Calderón de la Barca,* 4 vols., Madrid, 1917, III, 120–23. The resemblance is very slight, and Killigrew may only have been familiar with some imitation of *La Dama Duende;* one such imitation was produced in Paris in 1641—*L'Esprit Folet* by Antoine le Metel. (See M. Summers, *Restoration Comedies,* p. xxiv.)

[22] Langbaine, *op. cit.,* pp. 313–314, defends Killigrew warmly, on the basis of the fact that he had shown a willingness to admit indebtedness for the less-known song in *Cicilia and Clorinda* (see Chap. II, note 39); and because "he is not the only Poet that has imp'd his Wings with Mr. Johnson's Feathers, and if every Poet that borrows, knew as well as Mr. Killigrew how to dispose of it, 'twould certainly be very excusable."

simply a song which he remembered and considered appropriate in his scene, while Volpone's discourse, being of the kind an amateur comedian would add to his private repertory, he may merely have set down from memory, recognizing that Jonson had done this thing better than he could do it. In tracing Killigrew's sources, the present writer has noticed how the dramatist's inventiveness always made him depart from them; Killigrew was not a plagiarist.

Perhaps too much time has been spent on the sources of what is after all not a very remarkable plot. Briefly, the story of *Thomaso or the Wanderer* is as follows:

Thomaso, an English cavalier, handsome, gallant, and a general favorite with women, has come to Madrid to see his friend Harrigo, attendant on the English ambassador; and to woo Serulina, a sister of the wealthy Don Pedro. Some years in the past Thomaso won Serulina's love and her brother's gratitude when he protected her virtue from assault during a military encounter. At present, however, Don Pedro has other plans for his sister, wishing her either to marry a wealthy country don, Alphonso (whom she detests), or to enter a nunnery. Accompanying Thomaso in his invasion of Madrid are two other English exiles, Edwardo and Ferdinando, both country gentlemen who can approach their leader neither in gallantry nor worldly wisdom.

Thomaso's method of wooing is rather unique, his first step being to neglect Serulina entirely and to form liaisons with as many ladies of pleasure as he meets. Two Spanish courtesans, Paulina and her supposed sister Saretta, are old acquaintances of his, but these he leaves for a time to Harrigo and Ferdinando while he seeks further afield. His comrade Edwardo also seeks further afield, and since Edwardo's adventures occupy quite a number of the earlier scenes of this play, they may be reviewed at once. Edwardo meets with Lucetta, a courtesan whose beauty and fine establishment so dazzle him that he gives her a diamond

for a brass chain in an exchange of love tokens, and then gets drunk to celebrate the excellence of his bargain. He manages to find Lucetta's house in the evening, and there, with Matthias, another patron of hers, he is victimized by his mistress and her establishment by being turned into the streets without his money, his clothes, or even the recollection of the names of his cozeners. He goes home to nurse his grievances, and there we must leave him in deshabille until he shall again cross the fates of the figures in this history.

In Madrid at this time resides Angelica Bianca, a beautiful Venetian courtesan who until recently has been the mistress of a Spanish dignitary, and who now amuses herself by having her picture hung outside her dwelling together with a notice that her allurements may be purchased at the rate of a thousand crowns a month. Thomaso's prospective brother-in-law, Don Pedro, is one of the few Spaniards who can afford so large an expenditure, and he is even now hovering in disguise outside her spacious house considering the proposition, when Thomaso approaches and stands, enamored, before the picture. Thomaso, to whom a thousand crowns is simply legendary wealth, consoles himself for the inaccessibility of the original by taking the picture. Don Pedro resents this, but Thomaso's party beats Don Pedro's party from the field, and Angelica, having witnessed the conflict from her window, rewards the cavalier's gallantry by bating her price in his case to nothing. In fact she finds herself truly in love for the first time, so much so that when Don Pedro returns with his thousand crowns, she turns it over in a lump sum to his rival.

Although through Angelica's mediations and Thomaso's diplomacy, a sort of peace is patched up between the latter and Don Pedro, Serulina gets wind of a plot of her brother's friends to take revenge upon the Englishman, and she ventures out in disguise to warn him. (Until rather late in the play, Thomaso never approaches Serulina except through an envoy, Harrigo, who urges his friend's suit with yeoman vigor.) While abroad, Serulina attracts the attention of her brother, who is not too much absorbed in Angelica to lack interest in other women. Fearing his wrath

if he discover her identity, she takes refuge in the first open door, only to be confronted by Edwardo, who is still so angry at his recent mishap that he is prepared to enact reprisals upon the whole sex. Serulina is rescued, however, both from discovery by her brother and from attack by Edwardo by the timely arrival home of Thomaso. From this point on Thomaso is somewhat more diligent in his attentions, and with the co-operation of his friends he arranges an elopement with Serulina.

About this time the numerous courtesans with whom Thomaso has been trafficking (to the utter indifference of his sweetheart!) begin to play a serious part in his affairs. Saretta, who has been mentioned as the supposed sister of the more amiable courtesan Paulina—she is actually unrelated to her—having once professed a dislike for him, Thomaso has disguised himself and gained her favors, thus adding her to the list which already included Paulina and Angelica. This has so incensed her that she vows revenge, and Lucetta, upon whom Edwardo has by this time found a way to pay off his score, is so angry at all Englishmen that she is willing to join in a plot. Angelica, while not so violent as these two, is passionately desirous to prevent Thomaso's marriage, so her bad offices are also pitted against the prospective bridegroom. Only Paulina is now well disposed toward him, and she can do little against the savagery of Saretta and Lucetta. Thomaso is saved by an accident. Assassins whom the courtesans have hired to kill him attack another Englishman by mistake. Their victim is an acquaintance of Thomaso, whom he has picked up in Madrid and with whom he has temporarily changed clothes. Cornelius, for that is the name of this masquerader, deserves his misfortune because he has been doubledealing; and, fortunately for the comedy, he is not injured mortally. Most of the characters in the play are in the vicinity when the attack occurs, and Thomaso uses the excitement of the occasion to carry off Serulina to her wedding.

The later acts of this play have been interrupted by a farcical under-plot, which for sheer grotesquery probably lacks a parallel. Edwardo and Ferdinando have made use of the love potions of a

mountebank, Lopus, in order to win as brides two wealthy Jewish monsters, the one a dwarf and the other a giantess. The magic baths of this same mountebank are employed to alter these brides to somewhat more uniform size, but owing to an error in the application, the monsters become more monstrous still. Then the members of the mountebank's household run afoul of the baths until a perfect nest of monsters is created. Edwardo and Ferdinando are in danger of falling prey to the Inquisition for their connection with these transactions, but luckily the whole blame for the affair is placed on the shoulders of the guardian of the Jewesses. The escape of the two Englishmen is made the occasion of celebration, which is linked to the celebration over the successful conclusion of Thomaso's courtship. At the end of the play Thomaso and Don Pedro are friends, and Paulina, the gentle courtesan, is graciously received by Thomaso's wife. Serulina is not very successful, however, in her attempt to win Paulina from her life of sin. The courtesan, distrusting her own power to reform (and morally shocked at the suggestion of entering a nunnery!), goes off to Venice in the company of Angelica. Don Pedro, Edwardo, and Ferdinando go with them, leaving Thomaso and Serulina to their domestic felicity.

The preponderance of courtesans in the dramatis personae is startling, but as one reads the play, he realizes that these courtesans have been marshalled together as a means of introducing intrigue, adventures and comic escapades. The play is not sensual, but it is coarse to the point of painfulness. It is such a rough-and-ready production as might have been designed to entertain troopers in barracks, and the interest it offers is not a literary one. The synopsis scarcely indicates the complexity of the play, for many of the minor characters are involved in their own small adventures. This strange, mad world of mishaps and monsters, of aimless running about, is distressing: upwards of forty char-

acters are herded through seventy-three scenes. The play is a literary curiosity, for in its fantastical course, the reader will come upon allusions to actual conditions of the Exile, and will find himself at the heart of history.[23] The play is also unique in that it is semi-autobiographical. The plot as a whole is fictitious; but Killigrew was writing at the time of his courtship of Charlotte de Hesse,[24] and he made his play an envoy to his comrades of single life. In the character of his hero, Thomaso, he painted a fancy-portrait of himself. That Thomaso is intended as Killigrew is unmistakable, and the author's contemporaries recognized the fact.[25] The name Thomaso is a sufficient clue, for in Italy Killigrew had used this name for his own;[26] evidence of the identity of Thomaso runs throughout the play. Saretta says she dislikes the Englishman because ". . . there is too much of the Curd and Dutch man in him; he's too white for my eyes";[27] and that Killigrew was conspicuously blond we know from the portraits which have come down to us.[28] When Serulina says, "There's the

[23] A few of these allusions have been quoted above; see pp. 102–03.

[24] A definite allusion to the courtship of the Dutch wife occurs in Part II, Act V, Scene 7, Folio, 1664, pp. 455–6.

[25] Flecknoe referred to Killigrew as Tomaso the Wanderer: see above, Chap. IV, note 58.

[26] See the superscription to his letter to Duke Emmanuel, British Museum Additional MSS, 20032, f. 18.

[27] Part I, Act I, Scene 4, Folio, 1664, p. 324.

[28] The National Portrait Gallery painting of Killigrew, a shrewd, aristocratic looking youth of twenty-six, gorgeously dressed, has recently been reproduced by L. Hotson as the frontispiece to his *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage,* Harvard University Press, 1928. There is also the Hollar engraving (see Chap. IV, note 57) and other pictures; besides Faithorne's famous engraving of the handsome substantial-looking middle-aged Killigrew, which is prefixed to the folio of 1664.

great Musick tomorrow, and we shall certainly meet him at the *Vespers;* He was always a devote to the fair Cecilia, and Dona Francisca; Musick was ever his delight,"[29] we have another allusion to a cherished personal trait. Killigrew's conception of himself as an amorous gallant is not an attractive one, but it simply represents a favorite pose among the cavaliers. Thomaso at least intends to be reformed by marriage; here and in other plays Killigrew's theory is the common one, that the wildest bachelors make the tamest and most faithful husbands.

Not only the hero, but other characters in the play were probably caricatured from life. Ferdinando, a sheriff in his native county of Surrey, and Edwardo, "a lost English boy of thirty," "an Essex Calf with two legs, posses'd with a Colliar of Croyden,"[30] must have represented actual people. Harrigo, Thomaso's particular friend, certainly did. Harrigo is Henry Proger, who acted as steward to Hyde and Cottington during their embassy to Madrid in 1649–50. Not only is Harrigo or "Hal" described as "attending the English Embassadour" in the dramatis personae, but in Part I, Act I, Scene 2, of the play there occurs this informing colloquy:

Ferd. Prithee what Countryman art thou, that put'st so many R's into thy English?

Porter [Servant of Harrigo]. A Britain, Sir, Glamorgan-shire, Sire and Dam.

Thomaso. Take heed, dost know what thou hast done, to ask a

[29] Part I, Act III, Scene 4. For Killigrew as a music-lover see above, p. 132.

[30] Part I, Act I, Scene 5 (p. 325); Part II, Act III, Scene 3 (p. 419).

> Welshman what Country man he is? By this light, 'tis ten to one but he falls into a fit of Heraldry or Genealogy.

It was from Werndee, Glamorganshire, that Henry Proger and his brothers, several of whom were conspicuous in the Royalist cause, originally came.[31] This friend of Killigrew had been the ringleader of those Royalists in Madrid who thought they were exacting reprisal for the execution of Charles I when they assassinated Antony Ascham, the Commonwealth envoy to Spain.[32] In this connection the following passage in Killigrew's play is of interest. Saretta, instructing her assassins, says:

> At the corner of the Piazza we'l expect you, where from the Carmelites we may stand and see which way he takes; and when 'tis done [i.e. the murder] 'tis but stepping in and we are safe, or pass through the Venetian Embassadours which is but three doors off.[33]

Ascham's assassins took sanctuary in a church, while their leader, Proger, actually did find refuge in the house of the Venetian ambassador.[34] Such human and

[31] G. T. Clark, *Limbus Patrum Morganiae et Glamorganiae,* London, 1886, p. 253.

[32] Edward, Earl of Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England,* V, 151–52; *Cal. State Papers Venetian,* 1647–52, pp. 147–48.

[33] Part II, Act IV, Scene 5, Folio, 1664, p. 439.

[34] Of course Ascham's assassination took place some years before this play was written, and Henry Proger or "Harrigo" was not attending the English ambassador in Madrid in 1654. This fact makes one doubt if Killigrew's play were actually written in Madrid as its title pages claim. Usually the statements on the title pages concerning the place of composition of plays can be corroborated from other sources, but certain discrepancies occur. (See Chap. VI, p. 192.) Killigrew had written to one of the Proger brothers before going up to Paris (see Chap. III, note 55), and he may not have left Paris to go to Madrid but simply have talked to Henry Proger about Madrid before writing his *Thomaso.*

historical contacts as this make a study of even *Thomaso or the Wanderer* worth while.

Killigrew's comedy was itself never acted, but an adaptation of it, called *The Rover or the Banished Cavaliers,* written by Aphra Behn, was brought out at the Duke's House in 1677. Considering the utter unfitness of Killigrew's play for the stage, it is curious that Mrs. Behn's adaptation should have become a favorite acting comedy, a revival of it occurring as late as 1790, when Kemble brought it out at Drury Lane in a deodorized version called *Love in Many Masques.*[35] The author of *The Rover* found it necessary to add a postscript to the printed version of her play:

> This Play had been sooner in Print, but for a Report about the town (made by some either very Malitious or very Ignorant) that 'twas Thomaso alter'd; which made the Book-sellers fear some trouble from the Proprietor of that Admirable Play, which indeed has Wit enough to stock a Poet, and is not to be piec't or mended by any but the Excellent Author himself. That I have stol'n some hints from it may be a proof, that I valu'd it more than to pretend to alter it: . . .[36]

The lady continues to protest in the same disingenuous strain, but the fact remains that the "hints" she confesses to have stolen consist of nothing less than the plot, the characters (some with their original names), and the gist of many of the speeches of the older play.[37]

[35] For the stage history of the two parts of Aphra Behn's play, see M. Summers, *The Works of Aphra Behn,* 6 vols., London, 1915, I, 5, 112.

[36] *Ibid.,* I, 107.

[37] *The Rover* like *Thomaso* consists of two parts, but unlike *Thomaso* its parts are mutually independent. In her first part Mrs. Behn used the account of the cavalier's love affair with the señorita and his intrigue with the courtesan, and that of Edwardo's adventures; in her second part (which did not prove successful upon the stage) she gleaned what was left, even using the unpromising material of the Jewish monsters.

There is no question, however, but that she has improved upon *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* and her play is a tribute to her literary dexterity if not to her taste in choosing subject-matter.

Since so much opprobrium has attached to Thomas Killigrew for writing *The Parson's Wedding,* it is unfortunate that a survey of his works must conclude with a consideration of the same kind of play.[38] Again one must introduce the reminder that such plays comprise the minor portion of his works. For the superfluity of courtesans in his comedies he compensates with the many chaste maidens of his more serious plays. For him there were two kinds of women: angelic women, and courtesans, with the latter class subdivided into good courtesans and bad courtesans. He was capable of railing against women, but he was also capable of saying in all sincerity, " 'Tis as rare to find a Constant man, as a faulty Woman."[39] There are some passages of pleasant and spontaneous wit in *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* but there are more pas-

[38] With the writing of *Thomaso or the Wanderer,* Killigrew brought his career as a dramatist to an end. His plays, as we have seen, were not very successful upon the Restoration stage, and he seems to have taken formal farewell of authorship when he collected his works in folio in 1663–64. Among the titles lettered upon the books representing his plays in Faithhorne's engraving occurs " The Revenge," but this may have been an alternate title for one of the two plays not represented in the picture. A play called *The Revenge,* actually an alteration of Marston's *Dutch Courtesan,* was acted at the Duke's House in 1680 and has generally been accredited to Betterton. (See T. E. Baker, *Biographia Dramatica,* 3 vols., London, 1812, III, 203.) It is quite possible that Killigrew had his hand in a few revisions of this kind, but it is not likely that he had anything to do with *The Revenge,* considering its date and the date the title was listed among his works.

[39] *Cicilia and Clorinda,* Part I, Act IV, Scene 3, Folio, 1664, p. 250.

sages of unadulterated obscenity. With these we may contrast the pure idealism of Lucius' speech as he describes his courtship of Cicilia:

> . . . thus in silent secretness we in friendship past our days, undiscerned or envied; the fish that glides in the silent stream, the Parthian arrow, nor Birds that gently cut the air, make not less noise, nor leave less pathes nor stains behind, than our love . . .[40]

Like the age in which he lived and the circle in which he moved, Thomas Killigrew was full of strange contradictions. He had been born before Shakespeare had died, and he had breathed the air of an older London. Perhaps this explains why we can sometimes detect a spark of insight in the smoke of his scurrility; or can glimpse, through the haze of his rhetoric, the foothills of poetry.

[40] *Cicilia and Clorinda,* Part II, Act II, Scene 1, Folio, 1664, pp. 274–75.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(This list is confined to those books of which specific use has been made in the foregoing chapters. A general bibliography of Killigrew's period is, of course, not intended.)

I

(1) The/Prisoners/and/Claracilla./Two Tragae-Comedies./As they were presented at the/*Phoenix* in *Drury-Lane,* by her/M^ties^ Servants./Written by *Tho. Killigrew,* Gent./ London/Printed by *T Cotes,* for *Andrew Crooke,*/and are to be sold at his shop, at the/signe of the Greene *Dragon* in *Pauls*/Church-yard. 1641.

(2) Comedies,/and/Tragedies./written by/Thomas Killigrew, /Page of Honour to King *Charles* the First./and/Groom of the Bed-Chamber to King/*Charles* the Second./London./ Printed for *Henry Herringman,* at the Sign of the *Anchor* in/the Lower Walk of the *New Exchange.* 1664.

Contains besides the two plays previously published: *The Princess* (T. C.), *The Parson's Wedding* (C.), *The Pilgrim* (T.), *Cicilia and Clorinda, or Love in Arms* (T. C. in two parts), *Thomaso, or the Wanderer* (C. in two parts), *Bellamira her Dream, or the Love of Shadows* (T. C. in two parts).

(3) A News-Letter concerning the Possessed Ursuline Nuns of Tours.

Copies: Add. MSS in B. M., 27402, f. 70; Ashmolean MSS, 800, 3, ff. 21–27; Pepys MSS, 8383; MSS of Trinity College, Dublin, 1655. The letter is printed in *The European Magazine,* 1803, pp. 102–106.

Editions. The Parson's Wedding is the only play which has been edited. It appears in *Dodsley,* 1744, IX, 329–456; *Dodsley,* 1780, XI, 367–536; *Ancient British Drama,* 1810, III,

354–404; *Dodsley,* 1827, XI, 446–585; *Dodsley,* 1875 (Hazlitt's edition), XIV, 369–535; *Restoration Comedies,* Montague Summers, Ed., London, 1921.

II

(Sources of Killigrew's Plays. Contemporary Literature)

Barry, Lodowick. *Ram-Alley, or Merry Tricks.* Dodsley, 1875, X, 265–380.

Behn, Aphra. *The Works of Aphra Behn,* Montague Summers, Ed., 6 vols., London, 1915.

Britanniae Natalis . . . Oxoniae . . . 1630. (4°)

Brome, Richard. *The Dramatick Works of Richard Brome,* Anon. ed., 3 vols., London, 1873.

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. *Teatro Selecto de Calderón de la Barca,* 4 vols., Madrid, 1917.

Carew, Thomas. *The Poems of Thomas Carew,* Arthur Vincent, Ed., London, 1899.

Carlell, Lodowick. *The Deserving Favorite,* C. H. Gray, Ed., Chicago, 1905.

Cartwright, William. *The Royal Slave,* Oxford, 1640. (12 mo.)

Clitopho and Leucippe of Achilles Tatius (English Translation), London, 1855.

Davenant, Sir William. *Love and Honor* and *The Siege of Rhodes,* J. W. Tupper, Ed., *Belles-Lettres Series,* Boston, 1909.

Denham, Sir John. *The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham,* T. H. Banks, Jr., Ed., New Haven, 1928.

Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin, Armand. *Ariana* (English Translation), London, 1636.

Ethiopian Romance of Heliodorus (English Translation), London, 1855.

Flecknoe, Richard. *The Life of Tomaso the Wanderer,* G. Thorn-Drury, Ed., London, 1925.

Glapthorne, Henry. *The Plays and Poems of Henry Glapthorne,* J. Pearson, Ed., London, 1874.

Killigrew, Henry. *Pallantus and Eudora,* Folio, 1653.

Killigrew, Sir William. *The Artless Midnight Thoughts of a Gentleman at Court . . .* etc., London, 1684.

——. *Selindra; Pandora, or the Converts; Ormasdes, or Love and Friendship,* Folio, 1664.

——. *The Siege of Urbin,* Folio, 1666.

——. (?) *The Imperial Tragedy,* Folio, 1669.

Jonson, Ben. *Plays,* in *Mermaid Edition,* 3 vols., 1894.

Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Works of the Famous Nicholas Machiavel* ("newly translated into English"), Folio, London, 1675.

Marmion, Shakerley. *The Antiquary.* Dodsley, 1875, XIII, 419–523.

Middleton, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Middleton,* Alexander Dyce, Ed., 5 vols., London, 1840.

Miscellanies of Fuller Worthies Library, A. B. Grosart, Ed., 3 vols., 1871.

Montague, Walter. *The Accomplished Woman,* London, 1656.

Montemayor, Jorge de. *Diana Enamorada* (English Translation), London, 1737.

Quarles, Francis. *The Complete Works of Francis Quarles,* A. B. Grosart, Ed., *Chertsey Worthies Library,* 3 vols., 1881.

Scudéry, Madeleine de. *Artamene ou Le Grand Cyrus . . .* Par Mr Scudery . . . Troisiesme Edition . . . Paris . . . M. DC. LIII. (10 vols.)

Sedley, Sir Charles. *Sir Charles Sedley's Works,* London, 1722.

Shirley, James. *Dramatic Works and Poems,* Alexander Dyce, Ed., 6 vols., London, 1833.

Suckling, Sir John. *Poems, Plays and other Remains,* W. C. Hazlitt, Ed., 2 vols., London, 1892.

III

(Biographical and Historical Sources)

Boase, G. C. *Collectanea Cornubiensia,* Truro, 1890.

Boase, G. C. & Courtney, W. P. *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis,* 3 vols., London, 1874–82.

Bragley, E. W. *History and Antiquities of Westminster Abbey,* London, 1823.

Calendar of Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library, H. O. Coxe, Gen. Ed., 3 vols., Oxford, 1869–76.

Calendar of State Papers Domestic. (From the year 1591 to the year 1681 inclusive.)

Calendar of State Papers, Ireland. (1600 to 1669 inclusive.)

Calendar of State Papers Venetian. 1647–52.

Calendar of Treasury Papers (and *Books*). (1660 to 1689 inclusive.)

Camden Society Publications.

Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, S. R. Gardner, Ed., 1873.

Moneys for Secret Services of Charles II and James II, J. Ackerman, Ed., 1851.

Nicholas Papers, G. F. Warner, Ed., Vol. I, 1886.

Williamson's Letters, W. D. Christie, Ed., Vol. II, 1874.

Carew, Richard. *The Survey of Cornwall,* And an epistle concerning the Excellence of the English Tongue, London, ed. of 1769.

Catalogue of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, London, 1870.

Catalogue of Thomason Tracts, 2 vols., London, 1908.

Chester, J. L. *The Marriage, Baptismal and Burial Registers of the Collegiate Church or Abbey of St. Peter,* Westminster, London, 1876.

Clark, G. T. *Limbus Patrum Morganiae et Glamorganiae,* London, 1886.

Collection of State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq., T. Birch, Ed., 7 vols., London, 1742.

Dictionary of National Biography. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, General Editors, 64 vols., 1885–1901.

Doran, J. *History of Court Fools,* London, 1858.

Drake, H. H. *Hasted's History of Kent,* Part I: The Hundred of Blackheath, London, 1886.

Evelyn, John. *Diary and Correspondence* . . . to which is subjoined The Private Correspondence between Charles I and Sir Edward Nicholas . . . , W. Bray, Ed., 4 vols., London, 1870.

Foster, J. *Alumni Oxonienses,* 4 vols., Oxford, 1891.

Froude, J. A. *History of England,* 12 vols., London, 1867.

The Gentleman's Magazine. Vols. LXXXII, CIII.

Hamilton, Anthony. *Memoirs of Count Grammont,* G. Goodwin, Ed., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1908.

Historical Manuscripts Commission.

Third Report, 1872; Fourth Report, Part I, 1874; Fifth Report, Part I, 1876; Seventh Report, Part I, 1879; Eighth Report, Part I, 1881; Twelfth Report, Part V, 1889; Fourteenth Report, Parts IV, VI, 1894; MSS of the Marquis of Salisbury, K. G. (Cecil MSS), Part VI, 1895, Part XI, 1906; MSS of the Marquess of Bath, Vol. II, 1907; MSS of the Earl of Denbigh, Part V, 1911; Report on Pepys MSS at Magdalene College, Cambridge, 1911; Laing MSS, Vol. I, 1914.

Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England,* 7 vols., Oxford, 1849.

——. *The Life of . . .* Written by Himself, 2 vols., Oxford, 1857.

Jesse, J. H. *Memoirs of the Court of England during the Reign of the Stuarts,* 4 vols., London, 1840.

Journals of the House of Commons. Vols. II, III, VIII.

Journals of the House of Lords. Vols. V, VI, XI, XII.

Journal of the Royal Institute of Cornwall, 1871–83.

Lloyd's State Worthies (2d ed.), London, 1670.

Lower, M. A. *Curiosities of Heraldry,* London, 1845.

Luttrel, N. *Brief Historical Narration,* 6 vols., Oxford, 1857.

Lysons, Daniel. *The Environs of London,* 6 vols., London, 1796–1811.

May, Thomas. *History of the Parliament of England,* Folio, 1647.

Notes and Queries.

First Series, Vol. I; Fourth Series, Vols. VII, XI; Eighth Series, Vol. X.

Miscellanea Aulica, T. Brown, Ed., London, 1702.

Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica, J. J. Howard, Ed., New Series, Vol. I.

Oliver, S. P. *Pendennis and St. Mawes,* An Historical Sketch of Two Cornish Castles, London, 1875.

Parkin, C. *An Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk,* 12 vols., London, 1808.

Parochial History of the County of Cornwall, Anon., 4 vols., Truro and London, 1867.

Percy Society Publications.

Autobiography of Mary, Countess of Warwick, T. C. Croker, Ed., London, 1848.

Pepys' Diary, H. B. Wheatley, Ed., 10 vols., London, 1893–99.

Proceedings of the Society of Antiquarians of London, Series I, Vol. III.

Read, Conyers. *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth,* 3 vols., London, 1925.

Review of English Studies, Vol. III (1925).

Rymer's Foedera, London, 1704–32.

Shaw, W. A. *The Knights of England,* London, 1906.

Stowe, John. *Survey of London,* C. L. Kingsford, Ed., 2 vols., Oxford, 1908.

Tregellas, W. H. *Cornish Worthies,* 2 vols., London, 1884.

Victoria History of the Counties of England. Cornwall (1906); *Middlesex,* Vol. II (1911).

Vivian, J. L. *Visitations of Cornwall,* Exeter, 1887.

Walpole, Horace. *Anecdotes of Painting,* London, 1849.

Wheatley, H. B. and Cunningham, P. *London Past and Present,* 3 vols., London, 1891.

Wood, Anthony à. *Athenae Oxonienses,* P. Bliss, Ed., 4 vols., London, 1813–20.

——. *Fasti Oxonienses,* P. Bliss, Ed., London, 1815.

——. *History and Antiquities of Oxford,* J. Gutch, Ed., 3 vols., London, 1792–96.

——. *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood,* A. Clark, Ed., 5 vols., Oxford, 1891–1900.

IV

(Literary History and Criticism)

Adams, J. Q. *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert,* New Haven, 1917.

Arber, Edward. Term Catalogues, 3 vols., London, 1903–06.

——. Transcript of the Stationers' Register, London, 1875–94. (Continuation by Eyre and Rivington, London, 1913.)

Chalmers, George. *Apology for Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers,* London, 1797–1800.

Chambers, E. K. *The Elizabethan Stage,* 4 vols., Oxford, 1923.

Child, C. G. "The Rise of the Heroic Play," *Modern Language Notes,* XIX (1904), 166.

Baker, T. E. *Biographia Dramatica,* 3 vols., London, 1812.

Chase, L. N. *The English Heroic Play,* Columbia Dissertation, 1903.

Cibber, C., and other Hands. *Lives of the Poets,* 5 vols., London, 1753

Clark, W. S. "The Sources of the Restoration Heroic Play," *Review of English Studies,* IV (1928), 49.

Dibdin, Charles. *Complete History of the London Stage,* London, 1753.

Esdaile, A. *A List of English Tales and Prose Romances Printed before 1740,* London, 1912.

Fleay, F. G. *Biographical Chronical of the English Drama: 1559–1642,* 2 vols., London, 1891.

Fletcher, J. B. "Precieuses at the Court of Charles I," *Journal of Comparative Literature,* I (1903), 120.

Genest, John. *Some Account of the English Stage: 1660–1830,* 10 vols., Bath, 1832.

Hazlitt, W. C. *Handbook,* Third Series, London, 1887.

Hill, H. W. *La Calprenède's Romances and The Restoration Drama,* Chicago Dissertation, 1910–11.

Hotson, Leslie. *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage,* Harvard University Press, 1928.

Lamb, Charles. *Specimens of English Dramatick Poets,* 2 vols., London, 1835.

Langbaine, Gerard. *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets,* Oxford, 1691.

Lawrence, W. J. *Elizabethan Playhouse,* Stratford-upon-Avon, Vol. I (1912).

McAfee, H. *Pepys on the Restoration Stage,* New Haven, 1916.

Masson, D. *The Life of Milton,* 7 vols., London and Cambridge, 1859–94.

Nicoll, Allardyce. *A History of Restoration Drama: 1660–1700,* Cambridge, 1923.

Phillips, E. *Theatrum Poetarum Anglicanorum,* Geneva, 1675 (3d edition).

Ristine, F. H. *English Tragicomedy,* Columbia Dissertation, 1910.

Schelling, F. E. *Elizabethan Drama: 1558–1642,* 2 vols., Boston and New York, 1908.

——. *Elizabethan Playwrights,* New York and London, 1925.

Thomas, H. *Spanish and Portugese Romances of Chivalry,* Cambridge, 1920.

Von Wurzbach, W. *Geschichte des Französischen Romans,* Heidelberg, 1912.

Wolff, S. L. *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction,* New York, 1912.

INDEX

Accomplished Woman, The, 59, 152
Aglaura, 159n.
Albovine, 194
Antiquary, The, 53, 180, 182n.
Arcadia, The, 47, 48
Ariana, see *Ariane*
Ariane, 148, 149, 150, 151–160 *passim*
Arlington, Earl of, see Bennet, Henry
Armstrong, Archy, 134
Arston, Sir Isaac, 83, 84
Artamène ou Le Grand Cyrus, 148, 204–205, 209–211
Artless Midnight Thoughts of a Gentleman at Court . . . , The, 34
Arviragus and Philicia, 56, 147
Arwenack, Lord of, Robert, 12
Ascham, Antony, 103, 228
Astrée, 148, 149
Autobiography of Mary, Countess of Warwick, 22, 23n., 30, 47

Bacon, Francis, 22
——, Nicholas, 15
Baker, T. E., 191
Barry, Lodowick, 180, 182n.
Basadonna, Pietro, 88
Baynes, Adam, Capt., 31n.
Beaumont, Francis, 121, 146
Beeston, Will, 172n.
Behn, Aphra, 114, 219, 229
Bellamira her Dream, or The Love of Shadows: date of composition, 212; source, 212–213; synopsis, 213–216; criticism, 211, 216; publication, 142–144; stage directions, 217–218; mentioned, 94, 150, 204n.
Bennet, Henry, Earl of Arlington, 44, 86, 109, 159
Berkeley, Sir John, 86
——, Sir Maurice, 37, 42
——, Sir William, 37–38, 42, 52, 68, 73
Blackfriars Playhouse, 190n.
Blurt Master Constable, 220–221
Booth, Capt., 113
Boyle, Elizabeth, Lady Shannon, see Killigrew, Elizabeth
——, Francis, Lord Shannon, 29, 30
——, Robert, 29–30
——, Roger, Earl of Orrery, 29, 146, 147
Britanniae Natalis, 27n.
Brome, Richard, 181, 219
Brouncker, Lord, 131–132
Browne, Sir Richard, 98, 104
Buckingham, Duke of, see Villiers, George
Burghley, Lord, see Cecil, William
Burton, Capt., 21

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro, 180n., 221
Camus (de Pontcarré), Jean, 148
Captain, The, 221
Carew, Sir Peter, 14
——, Richard, 16, 19
——, Thomas, 57–58, 66, 67, 69, 71
Carey, Patrick, 67
Carlell, Lodowick, 56, 67, 147
Carleton, Sir Dudley, 50
Cartwright, William, 44, 147, 159, 175
Catherine of Portugal, 34, 123, 131
Cecil, Robert, 18n.
——, William, Lord Burghley, 15, 17
Chaffinch, William, 133

Charles I, 19, 28, 32, 35, 37, 39n., 50, 57, 77, 79, 92, 188, 228
—— II, 30, 38, 50–51, 79, 81–94, 101, 105, 106, 110, 111, 116, 119, 123, 126, 135–137, 139, 192
——, Prince Palatine, 55
"Charlotte Jemima Henrietta Maria," 30
Chillingworth, William, 68
Chit-Chat, 125
Christ Jesus Triumphant, 18
Cibber, Colley, 191
Cicilia and Clorinda, or Love in Arms: date of composition, 204; source, 204–205, 209–211; synopsis, 205–209; criticism, 209–211; publication, 142–144; song by Carew in, 58; quoted, 58, 157, 230, 231; mentioned, 94, 216, 221n.
Claracilla, see *Claricilla*
Clarendon, Earl of, see Hyde, Edward
Claricilla: date of composition, 144–145; source, 152–160; synopsis, 162–165; criticism, 168–172, 174–175; place in the development of drama, 145–149; commendatory verse, 44, 159; publication, 142–144; stage history, 172–174; mentioned, 64, 149n., 193
Cléopâtra, 148
Cleveland, Earl of, see Wentworth, Thomas
Clitopho and Leucippe, 149
Cock Pit Playhouse, 117
Cockram, Sir John, 87
Coeur de Lion, Richard, 10
Cold Kennington, 24–26
Colepepper, Lord, 83, 85
Coleraine, Lord, 58n.
"Come hither, ye that Love," 221
Conspiracy, The, reprinted as *Pallantus and Eudora,* 35
Cooke sisters, the, 15, 22
Cooke, Sir Anthony, 15
——, Katherine, 15
——, Mildred, 15
Cooper's Hill, 70
Cork, Earl of, 23, 29
Cornelia, 73
Cornwall, 10 *seq.*
——, Richard, Earl of, 10
Cottington, Lord, 87, 128, 227
Covent Garden Drollery, 189
Coventry, Sir William, 136
Cowley, Abraham, 36, 104, 139
Crofts, Cecilia, first wife of Thomas Killigrew, 56, 58, 65, 69–70, 126, 138, 144n.
——, Sir John, 65
——, Will, 100
—— family, 38, 44, 65
Crompton, Lady, 144n.
Cromwell, Oliver, 88, 94, 96, 102, 111, 203, 218
——, Richard, 94, 108
Cymbeline, 212

Dama Duende, La, 180n., 221
Davenant, Sir William, 67, 100, 116–121 *passim,* 146, 147, 194
Dekker, Thomas, 51
Denham, Sir John, 70, 75, 99, 100, 113, 139
Derby, Countess of, 14
Deserving Favorite, The, 57n.
Desmarces, Sir Antony, 116
Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin, Armand, 148 *seq.*
"Dialogue between Sir John Pooley and Mr. Thomas Killigrew," 70
Diana, 150, 212n.
Dibdin, Charles, 191
Digby, George, 67
Doran, Dr. John, 128
Dorset, Earl of, 18
—— Garden, 119
Draghi, Giovanni Baptista, 131–132

Drake, Sir Francis, 18
Dryden, John, 37, 121, 124, 146, 188
Dugdale, Sir William, 114
Duke's Men, the, 117, 119, 121
D'Urfé, Honoré, 148
Dutch Courtesan, The, 230n.

Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, 28, 106–107, 109, 110
——, Queen of England, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18n., 24, 134
Elliot, Thomas, 103, 119
Emmanuel, Duke of Savoy, 89, 90, 226n.
Epicœne, or the Silent Woman, 118, 135
Epigrams of Martial, 37
Epithalamia, 69n.
L'Esprit Folet, 221n.
Essex, Robert Devereux, Earl of, 16
Ethiopian Romance, 149

Faery Queene, 47
Fair Favorite, The, 147
Faithorne, William, 144, 226n.
Falkland, Lord, 68
Falmouth, City of, arms of, 10n.
—— Harbor, 12
Farnaby, Thomas, 22, 46
Feilding, Lord, 48, 63
Fleay, F. G., 178
Flecknoe, Richard, 129–130
Fletcher, John, 121, 146, 221
Florence, Duke of, 91–92
Florentine History, 195
Foole's Bolt is Soone Shot, A, 23
Foote, Samuel, 13
Fox, John, 18

Genest, John, 191, 216
Gibbons's Tennis Court, 118, 172
Glapthorne, Henry, 28, 29
Gloucester, Duke of, 101
Godolphin family, 13
Gomberville, Marin le Roy de, 148
Gombould, J. Ogier de, 148
Gondibert, 100
Gordon, Sir Alexander, 64, 220n.
Grand Cyrus, Le, see *Artamène*
Greene, Robert, 181
Grinder, Mary, 108–109
Groatsworth of Wit, 181
Gwyn, Nell, 118, 126

Hals, William, 10, 134
Hamilton, Anthony, 127
Hamilton, Stephen, 190n.
Hamlet, 194–195, 201
Hampton Court, 25
Hanworth, 24–26
Hatton, Lord, 105
Hawkins, Sir John, 18
Henrietta Maria, Queen, 21, 23, 28, 32, 34, 36, 37, 54, 55–59, 60n., 63, 77, 79–80, 81, 82, 101, 148, 188
Henrietta, Princess, 80
Henry the Fifth, 190n.
Henry VIII, 12, 25
Heraclitus, 56n.
Herbert, Charles, 35
——, Sir Henry, 115, 118, 172, 173, 190n.
Hesse, Charlotte de, second wife of Thomas Killigrew, 105–107, 122–124, 138, 226
Heywood, Thomas, 51
History of Aglatidas and Amestris, see *Artamène*
Histriomastix, 59
Hollar, Wen, 73, 129, 226n.
Hopton, Lord, 85
Howard, Sir Robert, 130, 146, 147
Hyde, Anne, 105
——, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, 29, 76, 81, 83, 87, 88, 98, 104–105, 128 *seq.,* 227
Hughes, Mrs., 117
Huygens, Constantin, 22

Imperial Tragedy, The, 33n.
Indian Queen, The, 147

James I, 19, 25, 32, 39
—— II, 29, 35, 36, 79, 85–87, 105–109, 135
——, Sir John, 29
Jane, Joseph, 109
Jermyn, Henry, 37, 56, 60n., 82, 83
——, Lady, 112
——, Sir Thomas, 37
Jesse, J. H., 128
Johnson, Samuel, 23, 37
Jolly, George, 119
Jones, Inigo, 74
Jonson, Ben, 68, 118, 121, 135, 139, 221–222
Jonsonus Virbius, 68
Journal of Philaretus, 30n.

Kemble, John, 229
Kent, Joseph, 99
——, Richard, 119
Killigrew arms, 10
—— Bible, 41, 46, 65, 107
"—— Court," 123
"——," meaning of, 11
—— family, 10 *seq.*
——, Anne (niece), 37
——, Anne (sister), 28
——, Cecilia (wife), see Crofts, Cecilia
——, Charlotte (2d wife), see Hesse, Charlotte de
——, Charles (brother), 27, 42, 51
——, Charles (son), 107, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124–125, 137, 140
——, Dame, the "lady pirate," 13n.
——, Elizabeth (cousin), 13
——, Elizabeth (sister), 22, 29, 47, 103–104, 110, 138, 144n.
——, Sir Henry (great-uncle), 13, 14, 15–17
——, Dr. Henry (brother), 34–37, 42, 44n., 46, 86, 104, 109
——, Henry (son), 70, 105, 107–108, 112, 124, 126–127, 136, 138, 140
——, Henry (nephew), 35, 37
——, Sir Henry (cousin), 76
——, Jane, 12
——, James (nephew), 35, 37
—— of Arwenack, John, 12
—— of Arwenack, John, III, 13n., 14
——, Katherine (sister), 28–29, 103
——, Margaret (great-aunt), 13
——, Margaret (grandmother), 18, 27, 38n.
——, Martin, 10n., 13, 27–28, 140
——, Lady Mary (mother), 20n., 22–23, 27, 28, 42
——, Mary (sister), 29
——, Michael, 11
——, Sir Peter, 76n.
——, Raphe, 11
——, Richard, 11
——, Sir Robert (father), 19–22, 25–28 *passim,* 37, 42, 43, 50
——, Robert (brother), 27
——, Robert (son), 27n., 50, 107, 122, 125, 137
——, Robert (nephew), 27n.
——, Roger (son), 122, 125–126, 137
——, Simon, 12
——, Thomas:
Life: ancestry, 10–19; parents, 19–23; brothers and sisters, 27–37; relatives, 37–38; early homes, 23–26; birth, 41; boyhood, 25, 42–44; social position, 38–40, 51; education, 44–49; page at court, 49–59; member of Queen's circle, 55–59; tour of Italy with Walter Montague, 59–65; marriage to Cecilia Crofts, 65–67, 69–70; recognized as poet, 67–69; young

widower, 70–75; Royalist activities, 76–77; arrest by Parliament, 77–79; departure from England, 78–81; first mission to Italy, 82–85; service of Duke of York, 85–86; Ambassador to Italy, 86–92; Resident at Venice, 92–95; expulsion from Venice, 95–99; service of Duke of Gloucester, 101; companions in exile, 99–105; marriage to Charlotte de Hesse, 105–107; service of House of Orange, 106–109; Restoration enterprises, 111–116; manager of Theatre Royal, 116–122; his Dutch family, 122–126; last years, 136–138; will, 138; descendants, 140; — "King's Jester," 133–134; his wit, 134–136; satirized, 73, 100, 129n., 129–130; figures in jestbooks, 135n.; character and reputation, 37, 38, 62–63, 75, 109–110, 127–133; pictures, 58n., 67, 129n., 144, 226n.
Works: see *Bellamira her Dream, or the Love of Shadows; Cicilia and Clorinda, or Love in Arms; Claricilla; Parson's Wedding, The; Pilgrim, The; Princess, or Love at First Sight, The; Prisoners, The; Thomaso, or the Wanderer; Letter concerning the possessed Ursuline Nuns.*
——, Thomas (son), 107, 122, 125
—— the Younger, Thomas, was not Thomas Killigrew's son, 125
——, Thomas Guilford (great-grandson), 140
——, Sir William (grandfather), 13, 14, 15, 17–19, 25, 26, 42
——, Sir William (brother), 31–34, 39, 50n., 80
King's Men, the, 117, 118
Kirke, George, 28
Knipp, Mrs., 131–132
Kynaston, Edward, 117

La Calprenède, Gauthier de Costes de, 146, 147, 212
Lamb, Charles, 33n., 35
Langbaine, Gerard, 189, 191, 221
Langley, John, 114
Leicester, Earl of, 15
Lenthall, Sir John, 77
Letter concerning the Possessed Ursuline Nuns, 61–63
Letters of Dorothy Osborne, 47
Life of Milton, 128
Life of Thomaso the Wanderer, 129–130
Lincoln's Inn Fields, 189
Lincolnshire fens, 21, 31, 34
Lisle's Tennis Court, 119
Lockwood, Francis, 53
Love at First Sight, see *Princess, The*
Lloyd, David, 16, 17
Long, Secretary, 103
Lothbury, London, 23
Louis XIV, 135
Love and Honor, 147
Lovelace, Richard, 67
Lower family, 13
"Loyal Indigent Officers, The," 137
Lucasta, 67

Machiavelli, Nicholas, 195
Madrid, 103n.
Mainwaring, Philip, 21
Marmion, Shakerley, 53, 180, 182n.
Marshall, Mrs. Anne, 117, 189
Marston, John, 230n.
Mary, Queen of England, 14
——, Queen of Scots, 17, 18n.
——, Princess Royal of Orange, 28, 85, 101, 107
Masson, David, 128
Master of the Revels, 111, 115, 116

Match Mee in London, 51n.
May, Thomas, 68, 179n.
Medici, Cosimo de, 195
——, Leopoldo de, 91
Memoirs of Count Grammont, 127
Mercurius Candidus, 193
Metel, le, Antoine, 221n.
Middleton, Thomas, 220–221
Milton, John, 108
Molière, François de, 148
Molino, Francesco, Doge, 92
Monck, General, 14
Montague, Hon. Walter, 55, 59–65, 67, 152
Montemayor, Jorge de, 150, 212n.
Morosini, Ambassador, 98
Mortimer, Sarah, 84
Muckle John, 134
Murray, Sir Robert, 131
——, Will, 67, 86, 99, 100
Mustapha, 147

New River Company, 21
Newcastle, Duke of, 193
Nicholas, Secretary, 104, 105, 114

Oakeston, Sir Alexander, 10
"On Mr. Tho. Killigrew's Return from his Embassie from Venice . . . ," 100
"On the Marriage of T. K. and C. C.: the Morning Stormy," 66
Ormasdes, or Love and Friendship, 33n.
Orrery, Earl of, see Boyle, Roger
Osborne, Dorothy, 47
Overbury, Sir Thomas, 20
Oxford, University of, 11, 21, 27

Pallantus and Eudora, 35
Pandora, or the Converts, 33n.
Parson's Wedding, The: date of composition, 178–179; source, 179–182; synopsis, 182–185; criticism, 177, 179–182; publication, 142–144; stage history, 189–190; mentioned, 70, 71, 94, 129n., 193; quoted, 45, 46, 72–73.
Passionate Lovers, The, 147
Paulucci, Lorenzo, 96
Pendennis Castle, 12–14 *passim,* 20, 31, 80
Pennington, Sir John, 60
Pepys, Samuel, 43, 55, 111, 121, 126, 128, 130–132, 133, 135, 136, 172, 189
Percy, Lord, 219
Phillips, Edward, 130
Phoenix Playhouse, 172
Piazza, the, 74, 78
Pisa, 91
Pilgrim, The: date of composition, 191–193; source, 193–195; synopsis, 196–199; criticism, 199–202; possible performance, 191–192; mentioned, 44, 177, 209
Play of the Novella, 181, 219
Polexandre, 148
Politician, The, 194–195
Porter, Endymion, 104
Prince, The, 195
Princess, or Love at First Sight, The: date of composition, 144–145; source, 152–160; synopsis, 165–168; criticism, 168–172, 174–175; place in development of drama, 145–149; publication, 142–144; stage history, 172–174; mentioned, 64; quoted, 201n.
Prisoners, The: date of composition, 144–145; source, 152–160; synopsis, 160–162; criticism, 168–172, 174–175; place in development of drama, 145–149; publication, 142–144; stage history, 172–174; commendatory verse, 44n., 159; mentioned, 56, 149n.
Proger, Edward, 101, 113

——, Henry, 103, 227–228
Prynne, William, 59
Pym, John, 39n.

Quarles, Francis, 69

Ram-Alley, 180, 181–182
Rawley, Edward, 54n.
Red Bull Playhouse, 43, 117, 118, 173
Rehearsal, The, 121
Revenge, The, 230n.
Rochester, Earl of, 126, 136
Rosania, 159n.
Rover, or the Banished Cavaliers, The, 229
Rowlands, Samuel, 23
Royal Fishing Company, 116
Royal Slave, The, 147, 175
Rupert, Prince, 85, 104, 219

Sagredo, Ambassador, 98
St. Ravy, Sir William, 60
Salisbury Court Playhouse, 117
Savoy, 63, 89
—— Hospital, 36, 37
Sayers family, 119
——, Katherine, 122
Scudéry, Madeleine de, 146, 147, 204–205, 209–211, 212, 218
Selindra, 33n.
Session of the Poets, A, 68
Sforza, Count, 195
Shakespeare, William, 121, 182n., 195, 201, 212, 231
Shepherds' Paradise, The, 58–59
Shirley, James, 51, 121, 146, 159, 194–195
Shrewsbury, Lady, 126
Siege of Rhodes, The, 147
Smith, Francis, 53, 54
Somerset, Earl of, 20
Spectator Papers, 189
Stafford, Sir Thomas, 23
State Poems, 36
Stowe, John, 23
Strafford, Earl of, 179n.
Suckling, Sir John, 68, 159n.
Survey of London, 23

Talbot, Peter, 128
Teddiman, Sir Thomas, 131
Theatre Royal, 118–122, 173
Thomaso, or the Wanderer: date of composition, 218–219; source, 219–222; synopsis, 222–225; criticism, 225–226; biographical and historical allusions, 226–229; adapted by Aphra Behn, 229–230; mentioned, 180n.; quoted, 36–37, 49, 75, 81, 102–103, 106, 116, 150, 218, 226, 227, 228
Townshend, Aurelian, 67
Tromp, Admiral, 218
Turin, 91
Tyrant King of Crete, The, 35n.

Ursuline Nuns, see *Letter concerning the Possessed* ——

Valletorta, Jean de, 10
Vaughan, Henry, 67
Villafranche, Port of, 90
Villiers, George, 1st Duke of Buckingham, 20, 21
——, George, 2d Duke of Buckingham, 121, 126, 136
——, Lady Mary, 35
Virgin Martyr, The, 121
Volpone, 221–222

Walker, Sir Edward, 114
Walsingham, Sir Francis, 16
Warren, Col., 105
Warwick, Countess of, Mary, 22, 23n., 30, 47
Weaver, Mrs. 117, 130
Wentworth, Lady Ann, 67, 144n.

——, Thomas, 1st Earl of Cleveland, 66
Whore in Grain, The ("new-vamped"), 178, 179n.
William II, Prince of Orange, 85
—— III, 35
Wood, Anthony à, 44, 130, 139
Woodhouse, Sir Henry, 22
Worcester, Battle of, 94, 96
Wycherley, William, 121

Yarmouth, Countess of, see "Charlotte Jemima Henrietta Maria"